

Christian Faith and Life

Combining The Bible Champion and The Essentialist

Volume 38

DECEMBER, 1932

Number 12

EDITORIAL

Christmas Cheer

JOSEPHINE RAND

The winter winds are blowing cold,
The waning year is growing old;
But o'er the hills the sound of bells
To men a gladsome message tells:
To us a Child is born! Hear! Hear!
A Son is giv'n! Good cheer! Good cheer!

Peace on the earth, good will to men!—
The angels' hymn we hear again;
While with the throng on shining wing
Men voice the prophet's cry and sing:
To us a Child is born! Hear! Hear!
A Son is giv'n! Good cheer! Good cheer!

Upon His shoulder shall be laid
The government, tho' long delayed;
And His dominion shall be sure
As long as sun and moon endure.
To us a Child is born! Hear! Hear!
A Son is giv'n! Good cheer! Good cheer!

The Prince of Peace shall reign supreme:
The blessed age of which men dream
Shall dawn at last, night flee away,
His kingdom come for which we pray.
To us a Child is born! Hear! Hear!
A Son is giv'n! Good cheer! Good cheer!

Christmas

WILLIAM OLNEY

And art thou here again, memorial eber
Of the great Gift of Christ, Who came to save?
Multiplied years can never from thee sever
The Thought of Him, Who, for us, Himself gave.

What are the passing joys and pleasures fleeting,
The kindly gifts, the meetings for awhile
With other loved ones, weighted against the greeting
Of Love Divine and God's forgiving smile?

It is the Christ of Christmas, dying, risen,
And with us in His Spirit aye to stay,
Jesus, Who rescues souls from Guilt's dark prison,
Who is the Joy of joys on Christmas Day.

London

FREE—Please tell your Friends that we will mail them 5 numbers of Christian Faith—or, Bible Champion—FREE, with every New Subscription for 1933. This offer includes current November and December issues as long as our supply lasts: after that we will mail 5 copies of any issue available. Thanks!

A Painter's Sermon

ELSEWHERE in this issue will appear an article by Miss Ruth Sloan giving a brief account of the great English painter, George Frederick Watts. He painted during the reign of Queen Victoria, and was one of the adornments of her empire. More than a score of his great masterpieces are on display in the Tate Art Gallery, London. They are all of them preaching pictures. Some of his titles are "Love and Life;" "Love and Death;" "Hope, The All Pervading;" "Love Triumphant;" "Mammon;" "Life's Illusion," and so forth.

Among his canvases is a series of three dealing with the creation of man and the beginning of sin. The titles of these canvases are: "Eve Created," "Eve Tempted," and "Eve Repentant." The painter's grasp and expression of the spiritual truths is most powerful to the thinking mind.

"Eve Created" presents the figure of a woman standing erect amid the glory of a shaft of light, which streams upon her upturned face. Her form is draped in clouds of splendor; at her feet the lilies are blooming in luxurious abundance. Birds light upon the flowers, making their glad music. The woman's physical posture as she stands in the rainbow majesties of Heaven's light, gazing upward, expresses aspiration, rapture, ecstasy. She is tense with spiritual exaltation. This is the painter's conception of woman, as she came nobly exalted, fresh from the hands of her Creator. Evidently Watts has felt the power of that great text in the first chapter of Genesis, "And God said, Let us make man in our own image." It is woman made in the image of God whom here he has depicted, and the stream of splendor in the midst of which she stands stresses the fullness of her communion with the Deity.

The second canvas, "Eve Tempted," presents all earth's loveliness as the earlier picture, but the glory of Heaven is gone. Eve is no longer gazing upward into an open sky, but instead stoops caressingly over the flowers that are growing at her feet. Her face is thrust down into them, as if she were seeking to find life's meaning in their breath. She is sense absorbed, no more, no less. Heaven is forgotten. The light Heaven has shed upon her is withdrawn. The glory which had clothed her is faded. She stands

there in the midst of the delicate whiteness of the lilies, naked, unclothed.

But the impression as you look at Eve is not at all that the painter is producing a specimen of nude art. You are conscious of a moral motive in Eve's nakedness. You feel that she is stripped, that she is bare, that she is bereft. The painter's truth here is powerful. What he says is, when men let go of heaven and center their interests upon sense values, these values fade, and we inevitably find life becoming barren and empty. Sense can never be at the center of life without draining life of all meaning. When one's gaze is upward, rainbow glories stream upon us, and sense abounds in beauty and worthiness; but when the center of one's interest is upon things themselves, Heaven's glories are withdrawn, and even earth's beauties become barren.

The body is thus properly but the instrument of the soul, the vehicle through which it expresses itself; and it must remain in the background, spiritual sublimities ever occupying the center, or else life will fail. One can only enjoy sense when he is not attending to it. When he is attending to it, having forgotten the spirit, sense becomes meaningless. In "Eve Created" the sense universe was an enviroing loveliness, and the object of her interest was heavenward. Then earth's loveliness was sublime. It was glorified by the light of Heaven. But in "Eve Tempted" sense had become central; and while nature still had much of loveliness, with Heaven's glory withdrawn, it had already begun to fade.

But the painter's truth of the dependence of sense upon the spirit comes out more definitely when we have seen the third canvas, "Eve Repentant." In this the flowers are all quite withered. The lilies are wilted and drooping. The leaves are brown and falling. The birds are songless and dead. All loveliness has disappeared. The poet seems to be saying that nature's glory depends upon the heavenly light which stream upon it while humanity worships. That when humanity forgets to worship, the heavenly light is withdrawn, and all nature's glory withers away.

In this third canvas, Eve stands in agony of soul, not only naked but desolate. She is leaning against the trunk of a dead tree. Her face and form are pressed against it. Her

hands are clasped above her head. Dead leaves and withered flowers surround her. Dead birds lie at her feet. Even the sky is leaden. The whole scene is cheerless, forbidding.

How true it is, the infinite of man's life is in his upward reach and look. When he gazes into the face of God, a light surrounds him and sense beauty is seen resplendent at his feet. When, however, he withdraws his gaze from God and centers it upon the things of earth, not only is the light withdrawn, but all nature's beauty also fades and withers.

THIS is the painter's parable, and it is true. We can see his truth illustrated again and again in history. The first affect of Deism was to emasculate the English Church. Its second affect was to pauperize the English kingdom. It has been the same with modern unbelief in America. Determinism had first its blighting affect upon our faith. Later it withered our ideals. Today it has prostrated our civilization.

It is no coincident that the Christian nations are the rich nations of the earth, rich both in material prosperity and social well-being: the faith of Jesus Christ is spiritually creative, and because it is spiritually creative, it is also physically creative. Humanism in Italy produced the Renaissance, but in Germany humanism became energized with Christian ideals and produced the Reformation. Historically the Renaissance has been largely sterile. Historically the Reformation has been the most creative force in modern history.

Says St. Paul, in Romans, "The wages of sin is death" (Romans 6:23). Our painter might have taken these words for a text; and how powerfully he has presented their truth! Said Jesus, "Man does not live by bread alone, but by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Will Durant says he has pursued truth through science and philosophy for twenty-five years, and now that he has found truth he has found it is not worth having. He was bread alone truth; science and philosophy without religion. One agrees with Durant's estimate of such truth. It is not worth having.

It was against all such points of view and all such efforts that George Frederick Watts set himself, dedicating the resources of his richly equipped mind and spirit to an insistence upon the primacy and centrality of the spiritual in all that is true or of abiding value.

We are living in an age of driving activity. The progress of outward civilization almost makes us catch our breath. The old carbon light I once walked half a mile to see in a favored shop window is today as forgotten—yes, more forgotten—than the lamps and candlesticks which preceded it. The automobile which was the pride of a decade ago could hardly be given away today. Men are masters of earth and air and sea; and they are turning now to the photosphere miles above the tops of the mountains and to the unfathomed depths of the ocean.

But all of this is meaningless without man's soul. Indeed, none of this would have developed apart from man's soul. It is the soul which has made man earth's conqueror. It is not his body. It is not even his mind. It is the drive of the infinite within him; and it is only while faith keeps man's soul thus aflame with hope and aspiration that he can continue to press forward his increasing conquest. Religion is the great creative force of life. The master thirst of the ages is humanity's thirst for God, as the Psalmist cries:

As pants the hart for cooling streams
When heated in the chase,
So longs my soul, O God, for Thee
And Thy Redeeming Grace.

It is while humanity thirsts and finds the satisfaction for its thirst in the sense of God that material progress moves forward.

It is most impressive to me to find an artist saying these things that one expects to hear said only by a preacher. We sometimes misconceive the preacher, and think of him as a man who says what he does because it is his business so to speak. The fact is, however, the true preacher is himself an artist, a poet, a man who speaks what he feels, and who speaks simply because he must. Nevertheless, it is most impressive to find a painter, whose approach to ultimate truth is from the side of beauty rather than of rationality and of faith, saying the very things that the preacher says.

Life is in the vision of God; the settings of life are only incidental. Happiness is neither of riches nor of poverty. John put his finger upon the soul of all sublimity when he cried, "Our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son, Jesus Christ."

The writer has touched every level of human life intimately; I have gone into the homes of both the rich and the poor, both the learned and the ignorant, and I have found love and lovelessness in both. I have found

sickness, anxiety, aging and dying in both. I have found nobility and petulance in both. I have found spiritual exaltation and degraded sensuality in both. It is not the circumstances of life that make it, it is soul of life. Every human value loses its glory and finally withers and decays, unless the soul has its vision centered upon the glory of the faith of Christ. Neither ambition nor culture, nor even human love can permanently satisfy us, or permanently retain their sense of worthiness, except as they are linked to the glory of God.

Take ambition. Ernst Haeckel was the outstanding name in scientific circles thirty years ago. He gave his life to the denial of God and the soul. He died a few years since, having lived long enough to see his science rejected, his falsehoods exposed, his work discredited, and his life a failure. And culture is as vain as ambition; and merely human love must be admitted to be as perishable as the purple mists of the morning. The only love which abides is the love that is

rooted in the obedience of Christian Sonship. The only culture which is satisfying is that which is crowned in the knowledge of God, which Jesus said is eternal life. The only ambition which can never disappoint is the one which could express itself in the words of the Master: "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work."

The aspiring life alone finds a glory that abides. They who, like Eve, turn from God to bury their faces in the flowers of earth, ever find these values swiftly withering. Soon! how soon! they fade and become dead things—within our hands; and we ourselves are left naked and desolate in the midst of dead flowers, dead birds, dead trees, and against the background of a dead and leaden sky. Only he who keeps his face upturned can have flowers forever blooming at his feet, while the glory of the infinite both bathes his soul and enriches all about him. This is the poet's message in the Trilogy of Eve, and this is the deepest truth of life from the Word of God.—*H. P. S.*

Comments on Topics of the Times

PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., D.D.

The Bible Wholly Inspired

SOME one has tried to convince us that only the "theological truths" of the Bible are inerrantly inspired; therefore we may reject other parts or accept them, as we choose. The correspondent who argues in this way treats the Bible on this principle, and hence he finds many things in the Bible that he feels under no obligation to accept. "The Bible was not intended to teach science," is his contention. So when it touches on the realm of nature, it does not need to tell the truth. It may contain scientific error. Only the parts of the Bible which deal with theological matters are divinely given and inspired. Such is the contention of the critic. What shall be said in reply? Our reply is that the whole Bible is given by divine inspiration.

Making Good Our Position

Let us try to think the proposition through. Suppose God infallibly directed the Biblical writers when they stated theological truths, why did He set those truths in an erroneous context? More than that, why did He permit the writers to add so many extraneous

things, both natural and historical, if they are not true? Just think of it, would not that be a strange kind of divine revelation and inspiration which would be mixed up with a lot of error, and then require poor human reason to pick out what is "theological" and what is not? And who is competent to go through the Bible and tell us just what is divinely inspired and what is not so inspired? For our part, we do not want to carry such a responsibility either for ourself or for any of our fellowmen. How can any human being distinguish just precisely what belongs to theology and what has no theological element in it? Suppose we try the experiment and see how well we succeed.

Some Cases in Point

Take, for example, the familiar instance of the temptation in the garden of Eden. This case is used because the Modernists want to put it into the limbo of poetry and mythology. But let us see whether it does not involve theological truths. Note Gen. 3:1: "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made." Is there no theology there? There

certainly is, for it says expressly that the Lord God made the serpent. That surely is theology, for the divine name is used, and the creative power of God is involved. Take the rest of the verse: "And the serpent said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden." Here again the name of God is used, and is even put into the mouth of the serpent. Theology! We would also call attention to the narrative of the Noachian deluge, which is a real *bete noire* among the Modernists, and is usually put into the class of myths—at least, very much of it. But read it over and see how often the name of God occurs and how constantly His action is involved. "And the Lord said unto Noah, Come thou and all thy house into the ark." It is even said that God shut the door. Under the divine direction the animals were selected to be taken into the ark. Yes, theology runs through and through the whole Bible. No one can divorce theology from the rest of the Biblical statements and narratives.

Does the Bible Teach Science?

Again we have heard the changes rung on the statement that "the Bible was not intended to teach science." Would it not be better to say, "The Bible was intended to teach whatever it does teach?" Then when it teaches theology or religion, it teaches the truth. When it recites history, it gives a true historical record. When it says something about the natural world, it says what is true. Of course, everybody knows, or at least ought to know, that the Bible was not intended to be a scientific book. There are many things in science of which it says nothing; nevertheless, since it is a divinely inspired book, it surely must tell the truth when it says anything about the natural realm. It begins by telling us about the creation of the universe. Surely if God led the Biblical writers to tell us that as a fundamental truth, He would be able to direct them to tell the truth when He led them to say something about the structure of the universe. Of course, we do not look for technical science in the Bible, but we certainly do have a right to expect a divinely-given book to tell the truth when it makes references to the realm of nature.

Biblical References to Nature

Let us try to see the truth in the foregoing statement. We have said that the Bible does

not teach science in the technical sense. This is not a subjective interpretation of the Bible, but one that is based on facts just as we find them in the Bible. For example, the Bible says: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork." Here we have a clear declaration concerning the siderial realm, and the statement is true, scientifically true; but there is nothing said about technical and mathematical astronomy; nothing about the earth swinging annually in its orbit around the sun; nothing as to the various phases of the moon; nothing about the distance of the sun or any of the other heavenly bodies from the earth. When the Bible teaches that God created the first germ-plasms or forms of life, it invades the domain of nature and tells the truth; but it does not expand the matter into the sphere of technical biology; it says nothing about cells and their multiplication by means of mitotic self-division. When the Bible tells us that the earth brought forth the first vegetables, it again enters the domain of science and tells the truth; but it does not go into the intricacies of scientific botany or the biology of plant growth. No; the Bible wisely refrains from making our technical science for us; but that is no reason for saying that it makes mistakes when it refers to the operations of nature. As far as it goes, its statements are true.

And What About Errors?

The crucial question is, Are there errors in the Bible? This is a question that the evangelical Christian must consider frankly and without prejudice. It is a difficulty that should not be evaded. Many people are asking the question honestly and earnestly because they want to know. The candid evangelical apologist must meet this inquiry. Our reply is: In our modern versions of the Bible there evidently are some errors, especially in some of the figures, as, for example, between Kings and Chronicles. How did this occur? It happened through the mistakes of transcribers and translators. We cannot ascribe infallible inspiration to the people who did the copying. However, Orr, Cave, Shedd, Wace, Warfield, Westcott, Schaff, Wilson, and others equally capable, have shown abundantly that these errors are not to be ascribed to the original inspired writers. They crept in afterward, and now it is the business of true textual and literary Biblical criticism (in the sense of scholarly

investigation) to get back to the original inspired text of the Hebrew and the Greek. By this process most of the difficulties have disappeared, and we can trace the way in which the errors have crept into the texts we now have in hand. But if there never was an original divinely inspired text, what is the use to seek for it? All textual research in that direction is useless. But—think it through—if there was such an inerrant text, what an incentive that fact gives for the most intense and profound investigation! Indeed, that has been the one great fact that has motivated all the evangelical scholars who have gone into the work of textual Biblical criticism; and their researches have been eminently worth while in clearing away difficulties.

No Important Facts Affected

The great Biblical scholars named in the preceding paragraph, especially Schaff and Westcott, have shown again and again that the errors and variant readings in the many Biblical manuscripts have not in the least affected any important doctrines and historical data of the Christian system of truth and salvation. All of them remain intact. The so-called errors are regarding minor matters, and are of no real importance. Perhaps there is a providence in permitting them to occur, because thereby Biblical students are impelled to more profound study of the Bible, and thus they bring out treasures new and old from the store-house of divine revelation. That surely would be an objective worth while. This is a suggestion that we borrow from Dr. Shedd. The writer himself has discovered many valuable new truths through an investigation of the so-called "difficulties" and "errors." Yes; in both His Word and His creation God has left ample room for scientific and scholarly research, and has put the urge for such study into many human minds.

Christianity on the Campus

It is a sad fact that, in many of our universities, Christianity is ridiculed. Of course, this statement will not apply to all the universities, nor are all of the professors to be charged with antagonism to the Christian religion. In recent numbers of the *Sunday School Times* Rev. Milo F. Jamison prints a series of articles giving facts about the treatment of Christianity in some of our universities. "Very often sarcasm, ridicule and invective are used," he says. Here are a couple

of examples taken down verbatim by a student in one of the western universities: "The only sinner I can see is the man who thinks he has arrived—some little two-by-four, shave-tail intellect, who gets up on a little peak and hollers that he is saved;" "The saint is the only fellow who hates to die; he has missed too much." Other derisive statements are given which we feel are almost too coarse to be printed. They evince the temper of the boor rather than that of the man of well-poised intellectual culture.

A Student Who Was Persecuted

Do unbelievers ever persecute? Mr. Jamison, in his article in the *Sunday School Times* for September 25, 1932, gives a case in point in one of our American universities. He says:

One of our Christian young men raised his voice in protest against some of the anti-Christian statements made by a professor in one of his classes. The professor became very angry, and directed some very strong epithets at the student, after which he dismissed him from the class. The majority of the students in the class, seeing the unfairness of the action of the professor, voiced their own disapproval in a very hearty manner. The professor, flying into a rage, walked out of the room. Later he apologized to the class for his display of temper, but took out his vengeance upon the student, who was "flunked out" of the class, and lost the credits due him in that particular subject, because of his courageous action.

Counteracting the Evil Influence

In order to counteract the blighting influence of anti-Christian teaching in the classrooms and on the campuses of the colleges and universities of our country, a salutary movement has been organized. It was started five years ago in Los Angeles, California, and has since become an inter-school and nation-wide movement. Mr. Jamison is the founder of the organization, which is meant to help students in their Christian lives and experiences, so that they will not give up their Christian faith on account of the scoffs they hear in university circles. The object is to help them, in a real scholarly way, to see that the Christian system is founded on principles of verity and science. For information regarding this important movement address the Executive Director, University Bible Clubs, 572 Hilgard Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.

Theology As a Science

As a teacher of Systematic Theology for many years, the writer of these paragraphs

is persuaded that the various disciplines of the department should be taught in a scientific way, with the use of the best scientific terminology, both old and recent, that is available. If the student is to be a scholar and a leader of thought, he must be trained to use the tools of his trade. He must know the scientific terms that are used by scholars to designate the various topics treated in any system. He does not always need to exhibit these learned terms, for that would be pedantic, but he should know them so that he can use them intelligently in case of need. What would you think of a college professor who would teach physics, or chemistry, or biology, or botany without using the best kind of scientific nomenclature? Every branch of science has its special terminology, mostly derived from the Greek and Latin, and the specialist must master them. So it is with theology, which is often and rightly called "the queen of sciences." Strangely enough, the Modernists do not want us to use scientific terms in theology; yet they pose as very scientific gentlemen and boast of their superior scholarship! Is that consistent?

Some Samples of Scientific Terms

As has been indicated above, every science has its specific terminology. Pulling down from its shelf the first scientific volume that comes to mind, we have before us George A. Batsell's *Manual of Biological Forms* (The Macmillan Company, New York), which is used as a college textbook. In the index we find the following terms under H: "Hermaphrodites," "Heterospory," "Holophytic," "Hydranths," "Hydrocauli," "Hypocotyl," "Hypostome." What do you think of that for erudition? Yet we have given only a few and under only one letter. The Modernist would almost shake off his head if we were to use so many scientific terms in the teaching of theology. Yet the student who wants to specialize in biology must master the technical terms of his science. Professor George B. O'Toole's *The Case Against Evolution* (The Macmillan Company, New York), gives us a few samples taken from the Glossary: "Heterozygous," "Litopterma," "Meiosis," "Chondriosomes," "Organelle," "Protista," "Symbiosis." And remember, too, these are terms in use in modern science. Indeed, every science goes to the Latin and Greek for its terminology. Why do some would-be scholars want science in every department of knowledge except in theology? Is that consistent?

When to Use Such Terms

But some one grows "red-headed," and wants to know whether the preacher should use these learned scientific terms in the pulpit or in ordinary conversation. He certainly should not. As has been said, that would be pedantic. But that does not mean that he should be ignorant of the scientific terms employed in his scientific specialty, so that he can understand and use them in case of need. The physician does not rattle off all the big technical terms in medicine, anatomy and physiology when he enters the ordinary sick-room; but he ought to know those terms; they belong to his scientific specialty. We once went into the class-room of a professor in a medical university, and listened to his lecture. He used so many technical terms that we did not understand half of what he said. But the medical students and physicians in the room understood him, and saw the necessity of their mastering the technique of their profession. So the theologian—and that means every preacher—should be familiar with the technique of his sacred calling. He should have a scholarly background.

Professor Yahuda's Testimony

According to *The Fundamentalist* (English), Professor A. S. Yahuda, formerly of the Universities of Berlin and Madrid, has spent forty years in studying the origin of the Hebrew and Egyptian languages, and therefore is well entitled to speak with authority. He recently came out in defense of the historicity of the Old Testament. We quote some lines from him as published in the *Irish Evangelical*, as follows:

It has been assumed that the stories of Genesis were written during the Exile in Babylon about the sixth century B.C., because they bear such remarkable resemblance to the Assyrian and Babylonian traditions, of which the story of the Great Flood is a good example. If that were so, however, the language would have shown unmistakable evidence of Assyrian influence. Yet, on examining the origin of the words, I have found there is very little trace indeed of such influence. These stories are far older than the Exile in Babylon. They belong to the time of the Patriarchs of the great civilization of Ur. It is there that Dr. Leonard Wooley has found traces of a great and disastrous flood. These stories reached Israel in the eighteenth century B.C., and were based on contemporary accounts of the happenings described.

Further Witness of the Same Kind

This is so interesting that we continue Professor Yahuda's testimony:

The story of Joseph in Egypt has been adjudged by Bible critics to be so faint and inconclusive that it must have been written many centuries after it all happened. Yet examination of the language shows an extraordinary influence of Egyptian words and phrases and an amazing familiarity with the life and customs of that country. The terse descriptions which were considered so vague have now become illuminating. This account must have been written by one who knew Egyptian, who thought in Egyptian, and who wrote in Hebrew . . . The Hebrew language must have first originated as a Canaanite dialect, and developed under Egyptian influence to the literary language of the Pentateuch. Its grammar differs from all other Semitic languages. It shows a definite Egyptian influence, and cannot be properly understood by the scholar who is not familiar with the Egyptian language. . . . Further, there are many phrases in Egyptian inscriptions which Egyptologists cannot understand, and these are now being read by studying the Hebrew equivalent. Archaeological evidence of the Exodus is now borne out by this additional proof. We must assume that the story of that great journey was written by people who actually took part in it—people of Egyptian upbringing, and for the benefit of people who knew well the life and manners of Egypt.

Not Ignorance—Only Lack of Information

A feminine British Modernist has been lecturing in England. She has been trying to throw "the light of modern scientific discovery on the exegesis of the Bible." Her whole outlook, however, is modernistic. Here is a sample of her technical scholarship:

It might be that the Israelites acquired the art of writing from Khammurabi, the Assyrian legislator-king, but in any event they did not write at the time of the Patriarch Abraham.

On this blunder of a "scholar" the editor

of *The Fundamentalist* comments as follows:

Khammurabi and Abraham were of much the same date, as every reader of Gen. 14 knows: so if the Israelites learned writing from Khammurabi, they must have been able to write in the days of Abraham. The only objection to this conclusion, a really conclusive one, is that, in the days of Khammurabi and Abraham, there were no Israelites. We might perhaps date the beginning of the tribal existence of Israel from the death of Jacob, and that was very nearly two hundred and fifty years after Abraham reached his prime. The Israelites were the descendants of Jacob.

Man and the Big Universe

So often have we discussed this subject in these paragraphs that some of our readers may become weary of it. However, we believe that the corroborating testimony of Dr. Joseph Stump, in his new book on Christian Dogmatics (see our Book Review Department) will be encouraging. We quote (pp. 68,71):

. . . It is urged that the Biblical account (of the creation) gives to the earth an importance out of all proportion to its size in relation to the rest of the universe. But the importance of a planet destined by God to be the abode of creatures made in His own image cannot be judged by its material size . . . It is evident from the Biblical account of the creation, as well as from the whole tenor of Scripture, that the earth and man are regarded as occupying a central place in God's mind. This will not appear unreasonable, in spite of the vastness of the universe, if we remember that a single personal being made in God's image is, and must be, in His eyes of greater value than a planet or a fixed star; indeed, than the entire material universe. Christ tells us that a single soul is of more value than the whole world (Matt. 16:28).

A Lasting Christmas Present

YOU give children toys and candy—soon gone! But sensible grown-ups like things that both please and are a continuing token of affection and regard. For this, *the ideal is The Installment Present new every month*, a fresh and engaging reminder of Yuletide and its ties; a lasting "forget-me-not" and "a joy forever." Such is **Christian Faith and Life**.

But more! This is not an ordinary magazine—it's extraordinary, unique in its line. Not merely the news, but the best thought in the evangelical Christian world set before you each month by a staff of twenty editorial writers. Then too, they write on vital issues—far more so than our political and economic problems, important as they are. For example, they show you the reasons for the faith that is in you—or can be—and the Christian bearings of current scientific discoveries. You can't afford to be unfamiliar with such matters, especially today. So, assure yourself and that best friend—or relative—of repeated pleasures all next year by sending them subscriptions to **CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE now!**—*Rev. E. Vandusen.*

Christian Evidence

BISHOP H. M. DuBOSE, D.D., LL.D.

Christianity and Youth

THE affinity of Christianity for youth and its accidents is one of its most noteworthy qualities; and in the study of this quality may be developed matter of a large evidential value. The evangel sets out with an acclaiming gesture toward childhood and adolescence. "Thou hast the dew of thy youth," is the climaxing language of the prophetic address to Messiah in the house of the beginning. The light and mystery of infancy and childhood deepen about the cradle of the King. The fulness and power of Life come to the Lad and the becoming Man. The record of his uncrowned years is the record of innocence and strength. This is the heraldry of redeemed and glorified youth; and this is its covenant with the Word.

It is not, however, that the message of grace is assured a more certain hearing from the young than from the old that youth is thus signalized, but rather that the fitness of the divine approach to humanity is best illustrated in the audiences of the young. "The church of the first born" is preeminent in the assemblies of the saints. Indeed, the assemblies preeminent of the saints are reckoned to be of those who are of preponderantly youthful years. Youthful also are the armies that attend the Messianic victories. "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauty of holiness from the womb of the morning." Virgins also are they which "follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth." Thus the kingdom of heaven has written into its records the tokens of youthful fitness and fellowship. The Galilean himself passed through the stages of infancy, adolescence and perfected consciousness, and was sealed to eternal youthhood in his sacrificial death, while yet no marks of age were on his frame.

The estate of eternal life is that of unending youth. Amongst the immortals there is never one to grow feeble or old; and the youthful Christ is the head of the immortal race.

Not only do the spirit and record of Christianity acknowledge affinity for youth; but they discover, as well, the very ideal of the kingdom as abiding in youth. The child in the midst is forever the objective of the evangel; and, by the language of its settlement, childhood becomes the chief institute of Christianity. "Except ye be converted and become as little children ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." The coming of the kingdom of God will be assured when the seal of the Christ is set upon the brows of a single generation of youth; and it is with the young that the consummation of the kingdom is to be realized.

Of certain of the saints of the old dispensation, it was said that they were sanctified from the womb, or from their beginning. John the Baptist was conspicuous amongst these, and the record was not meant to be either abnormal or exceptional: it indicates the true and healthy course of the regeneration of the race. The cases of these saints were thrust up amongst the story marvels of the Book to show what was the ancient and steadfast hope of the sanctification of childhood and youth. That is the pledge of finality for the whole household of God. In being made immortal, the race must be made forever young. Redemption is the spring of immortal youth.

CHRISTIANITY is particularly a pledge to youth; and the covenant was published from the beginning. "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head," is the initial record in prophecy; while the fulfillment of history is in simple accord: "And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down, and worshiped him." . . . "Behold this child is set for the falling and rising again of many in Israel." The Word maintains its consistency from beginning to end; and the tie which binds it into a unity is the promise made to the first born.

The Old Testament prophecies could not get away from the vision of a blessed youthhood. In beauty, this vision surpassed that of the lilies of Esdraelon and the roses of Sharon. The odors of Shulem were but a counterfeit of its fragrance, and the smell of apples but a syllable in the speech of its overflowing sweetness. Nor this in aspect and favor only. Wherever the truth and power of salvation were set forth in embodied fact and action, it was with the flavor and light of youth. Strength and almighty purpose also fronted these manifestations of the divine youthhood. Whether in the Messianic visions of Isaiah, the apocalypses of Ezekiel, or the ordeal of Nechuchadnezzar's fiery furnace, Christ was revealed, it was always in youthful relations and fellowship. In the Apocalypse of St. John, these relations of immortal adolescence were more than confirmed. The Christ of the Candlesticks had "his head and his hairs as white as wool, as white as snow," but "his eyes were as a flame of fire . . . and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength." It was the enshrinement of youth in the everlasting Fatherhood of the Christ.

All this cannot be incidental and unrelated fact. It must represent, in the record and pledge of the evangel, essential and eternal significance for youth. Christianity is pre-eminently the religion of the young. The likeness and office of youth are mystically corporate in the revelation. "The earth and the heavens . . . shall wax old like a garment . . . but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end." "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, today and forever." Duration only knows the infirmity of age; eternity lies beyond the years of time and change.

Have not these things been testified to in the historical and experiential fortunes of youth in the days of the Christian regeneration? No fact of the Christian centuries has been made more apparent than the appositeness of childhood to the Galilean Shepherdhood.

In the generations of her young the church has found a perpetual renewal of fealty. The kingdom returns to widened vision and accelerated activity with each recurring cradletime. In the faces of the children of the nursery, the church has found the renewed and more perfectly expressed image of her Lord the Christ. By reason of this perpetually recurring miracle of infancy, the Word has reinforced its claim with additional challenge and boast. Each

day the light deepens about the cradle; each day the heritage of childhood becomes more manifest.

There abides but a single testimony to the perfect childhood and youthhood of the Galilean Christ; but that is all illuminating both from the Christ side and from the side of adolescent humanity. "And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him." . . . "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." It was with this brief record that the perfect Youth of Nazareth passes into the estate of the perfect Man of all the ages; and it is upon this youthhood of the carpenter's son that the perfect youthhood of all the ages is to be built; and from which is due the final proof of the unchanging Word.

ABOVE all that has been said herein, Christianity is fundamentally and distinctly a call to youth. The praise ordained to proceed out of the mouths of babes and sucklings accords in form and utterance with the language which is preached "not with wisdom of words;" but with the metaphors of simplicity. St. Paul seems to venture the statement that the cross of Christ had been made of none effect had its messengers put aside that unadorned phraseology which has made the New Testament transcendent amongst the writings of the world. Not only the general word, but the particular word, of the evangel is thus related to the sources of power.

The Master meant much more than to assess the rustic simplicity of his Galilean followers when he thanked the Father that the secret of the kingdom had been hid from the wise and prudent and revealed unto babes. His thanksgiving reached to the mystery and substance of that which was then being revealed, the character of essential and glorious youthhood in the family to be headed up by himself in the heavenlies. This family is one with "the church of the first born," which forever types the life and estate of the redeemed.

The gospel call to youth is to enshrine and realize the Christ consciousness. It was within the years of youth and becoming manhood that the Christ consciousness was perfected. In the Galilean life and thought there was no residuum of the processes of old age; no reflex or reinforcement of years that must needs refer their virtues to the weakening of the flesh and the waning of human desires.

His completeness was that of the morning and the season of dew. So is ideal human completeness. It is of the lure and victories of the dawn and its early aftermath. "Remember now thy Creator in the days of thy youth." In this is written the call of the Word to the young.

The Galilean consciousness came of the taking up by the Youth of Nazareth of the mind and will of God with every thought and emotion of the Galilean life. With the perfecting of the Christ body and the last

motions of thought and soul native thereto the God Man stood forth in completeness, and clothed with eternal youth. Such is the hope of mortal youth, and such the pledge to it of the gospel—namely, that with every thought and motion of life it may take up the Christ consciousness and become perfect in his perfection. The slow but sure fulfilling of this promise is the Word's most certain proof of its own truth.

Nashville, Tennessee.

The Church in Europe

Rebirth of Religion in France

PROFESSOR CARL BETZ, D.D.

IN the whirlpool of French industrial and cultural life the religious question seems to gain in importance to such an extent that one may speak of a rebirth of religion. This statement finds support in the series of lectures given by notable men on the religious question in the University of Paris. These lectures were afterwards published in book form under the title: *La Renaissance religieuse* (the Rebirth of Religion). Among the lecturers were two Roman Catholics, two Protestants and two Jews. They treated the religious awakening in the sphere of religion and the Church as well as in the realm of literature and philosophy. The book contains also the views of two representatives of Humanism, that so-called religion, a "religion" without God. Inasmuch as France is overwhelmingly Roman Catholic, for thirty-nine millions of the population call themselves Roman Catholics, although millions do not practice that religion, a rebirth of Catholicism in France naturally must mean very much for the entire intellectual life of the country. With "sacred pride" Father Yves de la Briere from the *Institute Catholique* enumerates the evidences of an awakening which permit to call the generation of 1914 the "generation of Hope."

First in importance stands the Mission work. France counts 27,500 missionaries, members of thirty-six religious orders for men and of sixty-seven orders for women

who are active in foreign countries. The number of young men who follow the missionary calling is continually increasing. It is a sign of the times and highly significant that a part of these religious "congregations" have received sanction from the state. Without result protests were made against this sanction by the government. The school, the social and industrial life of France are made the special objects of Roman Catholic activity much to the chagrin of the forces opposed to the Roman Catholic Church.

Students in the big French universities such as the large Paris school for Polytechnics, the Ecole Central have experienced a decided religious change in comparison with their former religious attitude; the same is also shown by the statistics of the Easter Communion of 1927. This change of religious attitude may be explained through the development in the realm of philosophy since the days of Taine and Renan. Faith in the omnipotence and all-sufficiency of knowledge has disappeared.

An interview among the members of the Academy of Natural Sciences brought forth a remarkable result, namely, a nearly unanimous admission that science and religion have their own methods and are of equal rank and value. Especially does the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas gain new ground. Not less than three treatises in the second part of the book have to do with

the rebirth of Thomism, *i. e.*, the teachings of Thomas Aquinas.

Pastor Bertrand of Paris deals with Protestantism in a very illuminating and fine study. He shows that Protestant piety has been deepened in every way. Dogmatic controversies have receded and made room for constructive work in a creative spirit. Academic youth is filled with a spirit of genuine piety as in general the younger generation reveals in its societies and organizations a new spirit of real Christianity.

Since the religious revival in the beginning of the previous century the Protestant population of the interior of France—800,000 in number—did increase the number of their clergy from 120 to 1,098. Since the separation of Church and State (1905) their financial burdens were increased by ten millions of francs; yet they spent upward of 4,000,000 of francs for mission work. This is a remarkable record and a splendid testimony for the vitality of this religious minority.

René Gillouin, another Protestant preacher, investigates in his lecture the cultural effects of French Protestantism. Philosophers like Boutroux and Bergson have favored Protestantism even more than Catholicism. Valuable scientific work has been done in recent years by French Protestants. Efforts are being made by them to permeate the commercial and industrial life of the nation with a Christian spirit, or in other words to "Christianize the social order." This is evidenced by the periodical called: *Christianism social* published in the interest of social Christianity. Bertrand and Gillouin regret that the generation of 1880 assumed somewhat a modernistic religious attitude

which brought little or no benefit to the cause of Protestantism.

The present generation in contrast with a former generation takes a critical attitude over against prevailing democracy, for the reason that its anti-Christian character produces many evil conditions. Gillouin judges that this attitude against democracy reveals a considerable deepening of the Protestant viewpoint.

Rabbi T. Weill of the Paris rabbinical school reports that also among the Israelites in France (their number is about 150,000) a renewed religious interest is noticeable. This is very strongly manifested in literature which is made with pride the subject of a readable treatise by André Spire.

Even the opponents of Biblical faith who are represented in the book and advertise their "Humanism" as modern "religion" try not to deny the fact of a religious rebirth. One of them in fact admits that those who once loved their Church and received strength through it for their moral life have something like a feeling of homesickness for the Church although they no longer hold the faith of the Church. "They would be happy to be received by a new church which would have to unite all adherents of a universal religion."

Such a universal religion exists. It is the Christian religion, especially in its Protestant form. It is the only religion, beyond all dispute or discussion for the whole human race. A universal religion cannot be made artificially. God Himself gave us the universal religion; and it is the comfort and uplift also of the present generation.

Rochester, New York

That Christmas Gift

YOU needn't worry longer over that perennial perplexity—"What shall I give?" Give a gift that will come to him or her new and fresh every month for the next year and until Christmas comes again—*twelve gifts in one*, and all for a bit over sixteen cents per month; and all nourishing food, no waste. Give yourself the satisfaction of a good deed and your friend or relative the benefit and delight of a paid subscription to

Christian Faith and Life

for 1933. It is one of the few American magazines regularly summarized by the outstanding British Religious Quarterly. This indicates its quality. All need the information, instruction and stimulus of CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE each month, just as we need our daily meals; and the magazine should have not only your subscription but your boost and cooperation. Your friends need the guidance and stimulus that CHRISTIAN FAITH AND LIFE always brings with it. Subscribe *now*, and don't wait to regret your delay later.—Rev. E. Vandusen.

THE PULPIT

JAMES M. GRAY, D.D.

I. M. HARGETT, D.D.

ELMER ELLSWORTH HELMS, D.D.

MILTON HAROLD NICHOLS, D.D.

WALTER D. BUCHANAN, D.D., LL.D.

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D.

REV. CARLTON R. VANHOOK

THOMAS S. BROCK, S.T.D.

Three Christmas Faces

CLARENCE EDWARD MACARTNEY, D.D.

ONE of the most famous of the galleries of the Bible is the Hall of the Nativity. Here we see the portraits of Moses, David, Isaiah, Micah, John the Baptist, the Shepherds, the Wise Men of the East, the Angel of the Lord, Simeon, Herod, and Joseph. Looking into these faces and hearing what they have to say, we shall catch the meaning of Christianity's grand foundation fact, the Incarnation. In this gallery of the Nativity we shall center our attention upon three faces—the Face of a Man, the Face of a Sinner, and the Face of a Saint.

The Face of a Man

THIS man is the least mentioned of any of the personalities of the Nativity. Poets, painters and preachers give him but little recognition. He is a man who says nothing, although great things are said to him. Always he is in the shadow, in the background, as it were; and yet, in the drama of the Incarnation, he plays, although a human, a great and essential part.

Joseph was a just man. "Being a just man," is Matthew's sketch of him. The romance of the Galilean hills had ended in shipwreck, a shipwreck as disastrous and cruel as could be imagined. It was not that the love of Joseph had been thwarted, or that his love had died. But that the one upon whom it had been bestowed had proved herself, apparently, unworthy. Joseph was a son of David, and therefore was in line for a possible fulfillment of the great Old Testament promise and the coming of the Messiah. Now these hopes were blighted. The great painters, describing the Annunciation, generally show the Angel of the Annunciation presenting a lily to the aroused and amazed Virgin, a symbol of her innocence and purity. But now, in the thought of Joseph, all that was gone. Mary, his ideal of honor and virginity, he now knew to be someone and something else. This discovery has made other men wild with rage or sullen

with the hate that swallows up love. Had he been so minded, Joseph could have dealt in a very harsh manner with his betrothed, for under the Jewish law, a betrothal was practically a marriage, and by the law, as stated in Deuteronomy, a betrothed woman found in the condition of Mary could be taken out and stoned to death. "But," says Matthew, "Joseph being a just man was minded to put her away privily." His honor demanded the revocation of the betrothal engagement, yet he would do the thing as quietly, as privately, and with the least hurt possible.

This was Joseph's thought in the matter. Yet, undoubtedly, he was still somewhat confused and dazed in his mind. Sleep very often knits up the ravelled sleeve of care, and if a night's sleep does not tell us what to do, it will very often tell us what not to do. That night the perplexed Joseph took counsel of his pillow. It was a heavy head that Joseph laid down on his pillow that night. But while he thought about these things in the silent watches of the night, the angel of the Lord appeared to him and gave him the wonderful tidings which explained what had happened to the betrothed Virgin, and told him to proceed with the marriage. Mary would give birth to a son, whose name should be called Jesus, and who should save his people from their sins. That was the first time that mortal ears had ever heard that sweetest of all names, Jesus.

It was one thing to overlook and to forgive a great offense. Joseph was magnanimous enough to do that. But what a thing is this he is asked to do—to believe something which was against all nature and all human experience, and then, acting on that belief, to marry a woman who bore all the tokens of infidelity! Nevertheless, Joseph believed the angel of the Lord and was great enough so to believe and so to act. Being raised from sleep, Joseph did as the angel of the Lord had told him.

The next we see of Joseph is conducting his wife to Bethlehem to be enrolled in the census of Caesar Augustus. There he did a husband's and a father's part for the Mother and for the Child which was not his own. Joseph is the only man in the Bible who is honored by four celestial visitations. At Bethlehem, after the presentation in the Temple, the angel of the Lord again appeared to Joseph and told him to take the young child and his mother down into Egypt, so as to be safe from the murderous hand of Herod. In Egypt, when Herod was dead, an angel appeared a third time to Joseph and told him to take the young child and his mother and return unto Israel. When he drew near to his native country and learned that the cruel Archelaus ruled over Judea, he was afraid to go thither, for it was apparently his intention to settle in Bethlehem. At this crisis, the angel of the Lord came for the fourth time and told him to go into Galilee. Thither he went and settled in Nazareth, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene. After this, save for the brief appearance at the temple, when Jesus was twelve years of age, we never see Joseph again and never hear of him again. He vanishes from the stage of the New Testament.

The few sketches by the skillful hand of Matthew tell a great deal about the character of Joseph; that he was a just, thoughtful, prayerful, self-abnegating man, and a tender and devoted husband.

The subject of marriage has become one of the most discussed of all subjects, and very often by those who are the least qualified to discuss it. What we hear about is the outward form and contract and order of marriage; with new plans and theories; marriages of convenience and trial; "not until death do us part," but "Till love dies," or "Till interest subsides."

All this we hear, but almost nothing of honesty, reverence, purity, kindness, and the fear of God. If these things are lacking, it makes little difference what form or plan of marriage is employed. The highest nuptial mass in a cathedral, or the latest kind of companionate marriage,—the marriage is bound to fail.

The Face of the Sinner

AND what a sinner he is! It looks as if the powers of evil had at length come to their climax and produced their masterpiece.

What a face it is! Cruel, subtle, jealous, suspicious, able, intelligent; but wicked, remorseful, haunted, sinister, frightened. It is the face of the King of the Jews. The Bible delights in contrasts—Cain and Abel, Elijah and Jezebel, Paul and Nero, Pilate and Jesus. But what a contrast is this—Herod and the Child! And this face, a conglomerate of human sins and crimes looks down upon the Eternal Child! Here is the man who drowned his brother-in-law, Aristobolus, strangled his beautiful wife whom he loved so passionately, Mariamne, and slew his three sons, Alexander, Antipater, and Aristobolus. This is the face that waits for the coming Child.

Herod has always waited for Christ. In the Apocalypse, the woman clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars, cries out before the birth of her child, who is to rule all nations. Before the woman stands the red dragon, waiting to devour the child as soon as it shall be born. There you have the history of good and evil in this world. Whenever a good soul, or idea, or institution, or reform, is about to be born into the world, the dragon stands waiting ready to oppose and, if possible, to destroy. How many efforts there have been since the days of Herod to kill the Child, to destroy the faith of Christ—persecutions, hostile systems of thought, anti-Christian fashions and customs and morals. Herod is the man, not of first century, but of all centuries—the congenital and perpetual foe of truth and light wherever it makes its appearance in the world. Yes, even in our own hearts there waits a Herod, ready to destroy the child of faith and love and worship who is born within our souls.

Herod died; the child lived. "When Herod was dead, the angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph and said to him, Arise and go unto Israel, for they are dead that sought the young child's life." Yes, the Herods of every generation die, but the Child of God lives on. Always there is a noble and faithful Joseph to whom the child can be committed, and some Egypt which shall asylum him from the wrath of the enemies of God.

The Face of Simeon

I AM glad that an old man appears in this gallery of the Nativity, for ours is a generation which has forgotten to reverence old age, and is pushing the man of years out of every place and office in life. When we

look into the face of the devout Simeon, it is a mingling of the light of sunset and the light of dawning that we see.

I have never heard anyone say so, but I have always supposed that Raphael's great Sistine Madonna in the Gallery at Dresden is his conception of the presentation of Jesus in the Temple. Mary, listening to the words of Simeon, presents, and yet holds back her child; and her unfocused eye seems to be filled with wonder and awe as she sees far in the distance the awful and glorious destiny of the Child she is presenting to the Lord.

Looking into the child's face, Simeon pronounced his destiny and read his horoscope. "Behold this child is set for the rising and falling again of many in Irsael." Christ either condemns men or justifies and saves them. He is a stone of stumbling, or a rock by which men rise to greater things. This was true even in the days of His ministry on earth. The Sadducees, the Pharisees, Herod, Pilate, Caiaphas, Judas—all fell in Christ; while the woman who was a sinner, and Mary of Magdala, and Mary of Bethany, and Lazarus, and Peter and John, and the penitent thief all rose in Him. Always we rise morally or fall in Christ. When we let Him have His way with us, and our free will chooses Him, we rise to that lost estate which was man's before he fell.

Simeon looked again into the child's face and read there the sign of the world's enmity and opposition. "This child is set for a sign which shall be spoken against; yea, a sword shall pierce through thine own soul." The angels who heralded His coming with their celestial minstrelsy were silent as to the tragedy of the Cross and the wickedness of the world's opposition. But the white-haired old man with his mild eye and gentle face beholds the conflict and the darkness, and swords piercing many a heart. Here Simeon beholds the Child who came to bring, not peace, but a sword upon earth, who came to fling fire on the earth. On the cross Satan's opposition to Christ reached its fearful climax. The true index to the condition of humanity is what mankind did to Christ. Let us have no false or foolish ideas about the state of human nature as long as we must read human nature in the lurid light of Calvary. Wherever the true Gospel is preached, wherever the grand particularities of the Gospel are declared, there men will either like it and glory in it, or gnash their teeth against it. It is possible so to preach Christ

that He shall not be spoken against; but until that time when the Kingdom of Satan shall have been overthrown and every knee shall have bowed to Christ, the Cross and the Gospel will be the sign of man's highest and richest devotion, or a sign to be spoken against.

The old man looked once again into the soft face of the child and saw Him as the judge of men and the discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart. The thoughts of many hearts will be revealed, Simeon said, by this child. Already Christ is our Judge. He knows what is in man and because he judges us now he is fitted to be our judge hereafter. All life and experience tests us. But the highest test to which man is subjected is the test of the Cross. Christ died between two thieves, and dying He revealed the thoughts of their hearts—the heart of the impenitent and the heart of the penitent. So Christ divides between men.

CHRIST reveals what is great within us. That book, that painting, that music, that speaker, who tells us what is in our hearts, the best that is there, we like and cherish. Christ shows the spiritual greatness and possibility of man. He reveals what we ought to be and what we can be. Yes, at this Christmas season, here today, in our Church, the thoughts of many hearts are being revealed. If there is an evil purpose, an unforgiving spirit, a wicked thought, Christ is revealing it.

But, if on the other hand, there is pity for those in distress, a secret hunger after righteousness, a penitential, sorrowful sin, a sigh of benevolence towards all men, a deep yearning to know the greatness of human life, it is Christ Who reveals it. Not to me, or to the one who sits next to you, but to yourself. How clearly and beautifully it stands out.

Now, today, if He has revealed it to you, may His spirit enable you to realize it and to follow it in life faithfully unto the end. Not the end, as man thinks of it or sees it, but that end which God had in mind when He said, "Let us make man in our image," that lost image which Christ came to find and to restore.

Pittsburgh

Every place the word "success" occurs in the Bible—four times in all—it is preceded by "good."

The Meaning of the Incarnation

W. W. BUSTARD, D.D.

For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.—Luke 2:11.

THE farther we get away from some events, the less clear their meaning seems to become. We do not realize today the significance of the Battle of Waterloo as people did a hundred years ago, and, it is quite possible, unless we are careful in thought, that the real meaning of the advent of Christ may grow dimmer with the passing of the years. If we go back to the time of the advent we will see that when Jesus was born there was the realization of the supernatural.

The birth of Christ was no ordinary birth. It brings us face to face with the supernatural. It means the visitation of God. For Christ is God manifested in the flesh. Christ did not speak like other men, because he did not live like other men. He did not live like other men because he was not born like other men. The incarnation signifies not the coming of an absent God into the world, but the manifestation of an ever-present Father. Christ was not a revealer of God, he was the revelation of God and he alone could say, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

When Christ was born in Bethlehem, there was also the working out of God's eternal plan of salvation. It is here that we begin to see that God has a plan which has to do with the redemption of men. The Incarnation of Christ is the first great earthly event in connection with this divine purpose. The angels sang a heavenly truth when they said, "Unto you is born a Saviour." Christ did not come into the world merely as a teacher, a law-giver, or a reformer, but primarily as a Saviour, and we must never forget that the fact of man's redemption is wrapped up in Christ's incarnation.

Humanity must pin its hope of salvation to him and him alone.

When Jesus was born in Bethlehem there was also the culmination of an eternal process. As Christ was the Incarnation of God, the advent makes possible the Incarnation of Christ in men. It is now possible for us to be made partakers of his divine nature. If that is so, then there must be a likeness between our redeemed nature and his divine nature. It is when we are most like him that we think less of self and more of others. As

the world grows more and more Christlike, it grows less and less selfish. The nearer we come to him in the likeness of our lives, the more practicable become his teachings.

Justice and Love

W. H. T. DAU, D.D.

Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.—John 1:29.

WE behold sin working its direst effect and at the same time we see mercy achieving its greatest triumph over sin. We view together the sternest justice and the greatest love. The finger of the inspired interpreter points to the sacrifice on Calvary as the expiation of the world's guilt. This Jesus is the Lamb of ancient prophecy and the counterpart of Israel's scape-goat: he alone is the sin-bearer and sin-remover.

Lord Jesus Christ, thou innocent Lamb of God, without blemish and without spot, thou didst suffer for us, the just for the unjust. Thou didst not shrink from the shameful death of a criminal, in order to restore us to the favor of God. For our disobedience thou wast obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. Thy precious blood cleanses us from all sin. Thy death secures us against the death everlasting. O faithful Saviour, how can we sufficiently thank, praise and honor thee for the love and mercy which thou hast shown us? We shall, as long as we live, confess thee the patient Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Our sins are among those which thou didst bear: we too caused thy death by our vain conversation received by tradition from our fathers. Though this knowledge is humiliating to us, cause it to become fruitful to us as a warning against fresh sins. Let the daily remembrance of thy pains and agony assure us again and again that thou hast made our peace with God, and prompt us to crucify and put to death in ourselves all carnal desires and evil affections of our corrupt old nature. Aid us by the example of thy suffering to bear our own cross after thee without murmuring, and thus glorify thy meekness, patience, resignation, and reliance upon our Father's help in our own lives. Finally, give us strength to conquer death by virtue of thy death, and not fear the grave, for thou hast hallowed it to us by thy burial, and hast given us the promise that, because thou livest, we shall also live and be with thee forever. Amen.

Current Religious Thought

A Further Word About the Josephus Passage

PROFESSOR HERBERT W. MAGOUN, Ph.D.

THE passage in question is the one referring to Jesus. It contains only about 90 words, but during the last two or three centuries the comments on it have been numerous, and their words have run far into the thousands if not into the millions. Three times already comments on the passage have been made in these pages; but the subject is by no means exhausted, since there are still matters connected with it that have apparently never been thought of, to say nothing of being adequately treated. One of them has been mentioned in a previous article. Another will be explained in this.

Whiston's translation of the paragraph was published in the June number, 1931 (p. 299), and the difficulty, nay impossibility, of believing that the passage is a Christian interpolation, either in whole or in part, was set forth in some detail. It now transpires that one of the most determined, as well as one of the most learned, opponents of Christianity, Robert Eisler, Ph.D., has been driven to the same conclusion, and he therefore seeks in a recent book to destroy the influence of the passage by assuming that it has suffered deletions which have altered it from a derogatory to a commendatory statement. In defense of his thesis, he interpolates freely and boldly what he thinks Josephus ought to have said, but, inasmuch as he does the same thing elsewhere, when it serves his purpose, he overreaches himself and renders his conclusions untrustworthy.

In the number referred to above, it was said (p.300):

There appears to be no evidence that any one ever questioned the passage, until Scaliger (1540-1609) came onto the stage. He seems to have been possessed of a passion for emending ancient texts, and that was probably the true source of his tampering with Josephus in this connection. . . . He was long considered an "ultimate authority," but his results are now questioned, . . . and his strictures on this passage of Josephus have been given altogether too much weight.

Since the above was written the volume by Dr. Eisler referred to above has appeared. It is entitled, *The Messiah Jesus*, and is a large and compact book of some 666 pages. It bristles with citations from various documents, many of them in Greek and many in Hebrew. In dealing with the Josephus paragraph, he states (p.39) that Isaac Abravanel (1437-1508) doubted the genuineness of the passage, and he further says (p.40) that Hubert van Giffen (Giphanius), a "Protestant jurist and philologist" (1534-1604), called the passage "a forgery." No such statement, however, seems to appear anywhere in the printed works of this man, and Dr. Eisler admits the fact.

He says that the "oldest *printed* attack" came from the pen of a Lutheran theologian, Lucas Osiander, born in 1535, who regarded the "passage as spurious in its entirety." A Professor, Sebastian Schnell, (Snellius) followed him, he says, and backed up his opinion with arguments "in MS. letters," to which replies were made by other scholars, mostly theologians. All of these men, be it noted, were more or less local celebrities.

They have remained obscure personalities, although what they had expressed in letters that may have had a limited local circulation was finally found and printed in 1661, a half century, more or less, after they were dead and gone. They can hardly be regarded as having had any real influence on the world at large in this connection. They may, however, have furnished aid and comfort to certain Jewish scholars whom Dr. Eisler next makes use of in his contention that the Josephus passage has been tampered with. It has, in Jewish copies in Hebrew, where it is blotted out in its entirety!

Dr. Eisler certainly tampers with it himself and makes no bones of doing so rather extensively. For this he has absolutely no warrant beyond his own subjective impressions and certain doubtful inferences based

on questionable sources, in which influences exactly like his own seem to have been at work. Judging Christians by himself, he infers that they have made interpolations and removed words by deletions to make documents read as they wished them to read. As to the honesty of such actions, he appears to have no question in his own case.

He makes no mention of Scaliger, although this man has been called, possibly with undue enthusiasm, "the greatest scholar of modern times." Scaliger probably was not emphatic enough to suit his purpose. In this connection it may be of interest to cite some remarks by a writer in *The American Journal of Philology* (XLVIII. 140 f., 1927), who has this to say:

From the sixteenth century, when Scaliger first suspected this passage of Josephus, an enormous amount has been written about it. Practically all scholars of good repute who have investigated the question, are agreed that the passage is spurious, the work of a well-intentioned Christian interpolator, but of a very skillful interpolator, who was thoroughly familiar with his author. . . . It is still hotly debated whether or not some statement of Josephus about Jesus stood here originally and was supplanted by interpolation. The evidence . . . slight as it is, would be in favor of the belief that originally an anti-Christian statement stood here.

It would indeed be remarkable if Josephus, who mentions John the Baptist and James the brother of Jesus, did not mention Jesus also. The manner in which James is casually introduced as the brother of Jesus, "the so-called Christ," presumes that Christ is already known and would rather point to a fuller description of him elsewhere. It would seem inexplicable that these secondary characters of Christianity should be described, and no mention made of Christ himself, the more so that Christianity at this time was so widely known and was attracting so much attention from the Roman authorities.

He goes on to say that if nothing stood there originally, "there is a real difficulty, if not an impossibility, in effecting a satisfactory juncture" of the final words of section 62 and the opening ones of section 65. He concludes (p.147) that there must have been "an unfavorable account of Jesus, which was ousted between the time of Origen, about 280, and that of Eusebius, about 324, for a favorable one." To this extent he agrees with Eisler.

Both are forced to the conclusion that Josephus did write an account of Jesus and insert it in the place where it is now found. Both, however, go altogether too far in trying to make out that the passage was distinctly derogatory, and Professor Clyde Pharr is the worse sinner of the two; for he would

discard the entire paragraph and substitute something else. Dr. Eisler's position is much more reasonable, though it is likewise impossible, since too many contingencies are of necessity involved as has been suggested in previous articles.

As a matter of fact, the original passage was merely non-committal, although the tell-tale demonstrative pronoun shows that Josephus was not a convert to Christianity. That famous sentence, cited so often to prove to Jews that he admitted that Christ was the Messiah, may and probably did mean something so different that the Christian interpretation was a forced one. It is only necessary to recognize the practical certainty that the Greek word for Jesus was a part of the sentence as Josephus wrote it—no other position will tally with his habit in such matters—to get an interpretation that will meet all the scholarly difficulties, for the sentence, following the Greek order, will thus amount, in effect, to "The Christos Jesus this guy was."

IN the course of his article, Dr. Pharr mentions the fact that "Burkitt and Harnack" use "very ingenious explanations" in interpreting the passage, "according to which all other scholars both ancient and modern have totally misunderstood its plain statements." What their explanations are, I have no means of knowing, but the conclusion that the passage has been greatly misunderstood and even perverted from its original intention admits of no dispute in my opinion. The critics are right in assuming that Josephus was not favorable to Christianity; but they are wrong in concluding that a Christian wrote the paragraph as will be made clear below. Josephus wrote it essentially as it stands.

Eisler admits (p.36) that no one ever questioned the passage for some 1,200 years, and that fact in itself is highly significant. It shows how necessary a more modern and a more sophisticated generation was for the notion to arise that the passage was spurious in any particular. Before any demand could be made for its rejection, either in whole or in part, a new sort of mentality had to be developed. The simple truth is this: no proper regard for ancient oriental mentalities or mental processes has ever been had by modern scholars of any type, especially by those now regarded as modern and called by themselves and others "modernists." The term is not altogether happy in its application.

Such men are not aware that the oriental attitude toward the miraculous is as nearly antipodal to their own as it well can be, and they therefore take it for granted that their own ideas will serve as a reliable yardstick for those of men in by-gone ages. They are woefully and totally wrong. Indeed, it would hardly be more erroneous to say that the ancient Hebrew attitude was similar to that of the Vedic seer who, in effect, made Indra his own paternal and maternal grandfather and grandmother. The statement was not in that form, but it came to that in its ultimate meaning. The seer wrote or rather recited—writing was not used in connection with the Rig-Veda until it became a necessity to fix the text, and no book or manuscript is allowed in its transmission even now—one stanza that may be rendered thus:

What poet, pray, of those who went before us,
Has reached, in truth, the end of all thy greatness?

Who both thy father and thy mother also
From thine own body didst cause to spring together.

(R-V. X. liv. 3.)

The absurdity of this stanza is so patent that no modern thinker, even if he is an ignoramus, would regard it as anything but absurd, and yet that fact has no bearing whatever on the attitude of an ancient Hindu, as any one must see on a little reflection. To him, the stanza simply showed how wonderful Indra was. He let it go at that and did not question the matter.

To an oriental, a fact is a fact, and nothing else matters, regardless of what may be involved. The attitude of Josephus cannot possibly have been that of a "modernist" and it must of necessity have been that of a man of his own times. As a result, he would recognize a fact as a fact and not be unduly curious as to how it came about or what it involved. He might try to explain it; but the chances are that he would do nothing of the sort if it included items beyond his powers of elucidation. If he knew the explanation he would be likely to give it, otherwise not. In this connection the myths of the ancients must be remembered and reckoned with.

If the cultivated Greeks could entertain such foolish notions as were involved in many of their myths, the Hebrews of a corresponding age must be allowed a greater leeway in such matters than any modern person would tolerate, unless he belonged to a primitive race or was himself an oriental without western educational influences. This

difference of viewpoint cannot be ignored if reliable results are to be obtained in such matters. Former sins in this connection have been many and frequent. They should be abjured and the strange truth should be recognized. Missionaries in China have to be careful how they use the word for miracle. The Chinese have "miracles" now, as they see things.

IT was explained in a former paper (Dec., 1931, p.646 end) that Josephus could not have used the pronoun that he did if he had meant to endorse Jesus, since it may express contempt. That pronoun is usually rendered "this." There is another, commonly rendered "that," which is used to express approval. If he had employed this latter demonstrative, he would have committed himself to the Christian cause as a witness for Jesus. He did not do so, and he ought never to have been credited with going that far. He was simply stating facts as he found them, and that is all that he can be justly charged with.

Furthermore, the name Jesus was so common in his day that Josephus has about a dozen other men of that name in his works, and he is careful to give a means of identification with each one. (The index to Whiston's translation, edition of 1840, omits one Jesus on p.408, although the same man appears as a Joshua on pp.222,223). To suppose that Josephus did not treat Jesus in a similar way by indicating that He was the one called Christ is to be guilty of a superficial view of the matter. He was a careful Jew, and he wrote accordingly. Elsewhere (*Antiq.* XX. ix. 1), he has "Jesus, who was called Christ." This matter was also explained in another article (June, 1931, p.302), and the Greek can be rendered "the so-called Christ." The implication is that Josephus used the Greek word *christos* merely as an epithet to identify this particular Jesus and not as an acknowledgment that He was the Messiah. To him *christos* had its original adjective force, not its later significance as a proper name.

Dr. Eisler says (p.37) that some writers have gone so far as to credit Josephus with inspiration. Enthusiasm may excuse that sort of thing, but it is hardly an indication of scholarship. Eisler furnishes some documentary evidence (p. 46) that Josephus originally had an indefinite pronoun in his first sentence so that it meant, "a certain Jesus, a wise man," etc. He probably did write *Iēsous tis*, "a certain Jesus," since the use of the *tis*

tallies perfectly with the "this" employed below, and that again indicates plainly that he did not intend to endorse the Christian position. He did intend to tell all the facts as he found them, and that is all that a reasonable Christian can expect of him. As *tis* is not complimentary, it alone would suffice to show that he was not an advocate of Christian doctrines.

But if these three things hold good—the use of *tis*, the employment of a pronoun "this," which may express contempt, and a careful identification of Jesus—it follows inevitably that the next step will lead to the inference that it is practically impossible to escape the conclusion already mentioned: namely, that Josephus did not say, "This was the Christ," but that he did say, "This was the *christos* Jesus," using *christos* in its original adjective sense as a means of identification, precisely as Eisler now uses Messiah in the title of his book. He has not the slightest intention of recognizing Jesus as the Jewish Messiah: for his real object is to prove that Jesus was a person and not a mere myth, while at the same time assailing Christianity all along the line. He tries to discredit Christian documents, does not hesitate to alter them, and belittles Christ in every possible way that he can think of.

His contention that deletions have taken place in the Josephus passage is valid to this extent, two words have in all probability been lost, for one of them is found in, so Eisler says, "Several MSS. of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* (i. ii. 7)" which "have after the name of Jesus the disparaging particle *tis*." (P.46). That particle would seem appropriate enough when Josephus did his writing; but in a few centuries it would become wholly superfluous, since the whole world had come to regard Jesus as the name of an outstanding personality that needed no further means of identification. Other men of that name had ceased to count, and *tis* savored of affectation.

Furthermore, by that time the word *christos* had practically lost its adjective character and had become in effect a proper name or an equivalent to the Hebrew word, Messiah. That fact would in turn make the word for Jesus seem out of place in the sentence below, and it would inevitably tend to be lost or deleted. No one would be likely to object to either alteration, since all would be impressed by the same facts, and the Jews would still understand what Josephus meant,

taking *christos* to be used substantively, in the sense, *christos*-one. On the other hand, gentiles would take it in its acquired sense, and disputes would result. In time the Jews would begin to delete the entire passage from their Hebrew version, and such manuscripts are still to be found in all probability.

The deletion of these two words, therefore, would involve no impossible conditions, because the process would be a natural result of changed conditions. It is accordingly probable that both words were deleted in the days of Constantine (272-337) after his acceptance of Christianity, since a favorable opportunity was thus afforded and nothing more was required than the blotting out of two words that appeared to be superfluous. Subsequent copies of the manuscripts would then omit them. Our present text would be the result.

As Origen antedated Constantine, his dates are 185-253, the texts which he consulted probably contained both words so that he could not possibly misunderstand the position of Josephus. On the other hand, Eusebius (264-349) must be credited with the use of a copy that lacked the word Jesus, although he had seen one that contained the *tis*. He may have seen a copy in which both words were deleted and one that still retained the *tis*. He quotes the passage three times in all with slight verbal variations; but they are of no consequence, because he patently quoted from memory and merely varied as any man would under those circumstances. If he had had the text before him, he would not have said "about as follows" as he did. See the June number, 1931, p.301.

Misunderstanding the intent of Josephus, Eusebius used the paragraph in his efforts to convince and convert the Jews, and they naturally resented it. They do still. Hence the efforts of Eisler to prove the deletion of words which he supplies out of his own imagination for the most part, although he backs them up with dubious material from a restored translation of another Josephus document. Its dependability is extremely doubtful, for it shows evidences of the same sort of doctoring that Dr. Eisler employs in his contentions. To postulate the loss of anything more than the two words mentioned is pure guesswork, not to say buncombe.

The loss of these two, however, made it possible to take the passage in a sense never contemplated by Josephus; for their presence alters the whole color of the passage, as has

previously been shown clearly (Dec., 1931, p.647), and also makes it evident that Josephus meant no more than to record facts that were a matter of common knowledge in his own day. He acted accordingly.

Instead of weakening the force of this bit of testimony, a correct understanding of the passage actually makes it stronger; for it becomes the testimony of an unwilling witness chronicling things that he had to admit were true, although he did not find them to his liking. Moreover, he must have known the Jewish attitude and the Jewish belief that Jesus was a *mamzēr* (bastard). That will explain his recital of certain other tales involving scandal. They came to his mind naturally in this connection, although he did not venture to apply to Jesus the tales freely circulated among the Jews in his day. They are not only reflected in the *Talmud* and the *Toldoth Jeshu* but even crop out in the New Testament itself, if one understands oriental innuendo. "We were not born of fornication, as you were; we have one father, not two as you have (a real one and a legal one); our God is our father but not yours, a *mamzēr*." (John 8:41).

THE whole difficulty with the Josephus passage is the modern way of looking at it. It seems inconsistent from our standpoint. That, however, has nothing to do with the matter. It did not look that way to Josephus or to the Jews, for that matter, until the gentiles made it! This is shown clearly by the *Toldoth Jeshu*, which is confessedly late. It pretends to be a "history of Jesus," its sole object is to discredit Him utterly, and yet the sum and substance of its assault has to do with his birth. It calls Him repeatedly a *mamzēr w'ben ha-niddah* (bastard and son of a woman in her separation), which was the worst thing that a Jew could think of to say of any man. It put him beyond the pale.

While the *Toldoth* is unquestionably related in a general way to the *Talmud*, it is not possible to regard it as based on the passages in the latter, for the differences are even more marked than the resemblances. The references in the *Talmud* are obscure and so put that a gentile would not realize how much was intended. Sometimes he would not even know that Jesus was the one meant. What gentile would understand the term *Ben-Stada*? A Jew might tell him that it was of doubtful meaning; but when Tertullian says (*De Spectaculis*, ch.30) that at the sec-

ond coming he will say to the Jews, "This is that . . . son of a harlot," he is translating *Ben-Stada*, and the word harlot is probably more polite than the original. A Jewish rabbi of the third century refers to Him as "the son of the harlot" and as claiming that there are two Gods, *i. e.*, that He is one.

The *Toldoth* includes many details, but briefly it says that Jesus claimed to be virgin-born as foretold by Isaiah, to be the Son of God, and to have created the world. When they asked for a sign for proof, He bade them bring a corpse. They went for one but found only dry bones. He put them together and made the flesh return and restored the man to life. Then He asked for and cured a leper with the result that they worshipped Him. When He entered Jerusalem, it says, He rode on an ass and was acclaimed by the people. Plots against Him are made. He again cures a leper and raises a dead man to escape one of them. He is credited with performing these miracles with the help of magic developed from a use of the divine ineffable Name. His enemies finally decide that He can be overcome in no other way than the use of that Name, which they regarded as a bad sin. They agree to take the sin upon themselves, and Juda (Judas) undertakes the task. In the contests that follow, Jesus quotes the Psalms as He does in the New Testament. One conflict is up in the air. He repeats his miracles.

Finally, in the night, Juda with a knife cuts Jesus and gets the bit of parchment from under his skin, on which the Name is written. He is thus enabled to conquer, betrays Jesus to the elders by kneeling before Him, and advises them to fight his 2,000 followers and take Him. They do so, slay many of the disciples, and put the rest to flight. They scourge Jesus, crown Him with thorns, and give Him vinegar to drink. His last cry is recorded correctly. He is stoned to death, and they then try to hang Him on a tree. All break and refuse to hold Him. A huge cabbage stalk from the garden of Juda is therefore used. It holds. They bury Him where He was stoned, the disciples gather there and weep, and at midnight Juda steals the corpse and buries it in the bed of a stream in his garden after diverting the stream! The tomb is found empty, but Juda shows that he has the corpse.

The rest of the document deals with later events, including the efforts of Scimon Kepha (Simon Peter) to fix things up to suit them. He is placed among the wise men,

is credited with getting the Name himself under similar conditions concerning the sin, and then raises a dead man and cures a leper. The whole is a strange combination of New Testament facts and Jewish imaginations.

No charge whatever against the character of Jesus is made beyond the accusation that He got *ha-Shem* (the Name) by stealth from a stone in the temple and that He failed as a lad to show proper respect to some elders. The entire assault is against his birth; for He is repeatedly called a *mamzēr w'ben ha-niddah*, or simply a bastard without the rest of the phrase. Down through the ages He has been called that, and, as it puts a Jew beyond the pale, we can see how hard it is for Hebrews to accept Him as their Messiah.

IN the light of this mediaeval document, with its mixed witness to the miracles of Jesus and its assaults against his birth, any objection to the testimony of Josephus becomes positively silly. He uses only general terms, while the *Toldoth* is specific. Moreover, it adds the refusal of the trees to bear the body of Jesus. It does reject his resurrection; but many centuries had already lapsed, and the event was too far away to compel its recognition. By that time the whole effort was to discredit the very idea. In the days of Josephus, among the Jews, there were too many witnesses to the fact to allow him to dodge some mention of it.

The *Toldoth* pretends to give the details of how an unscrupulous rake got the best of Mary and became the father of her child; but it does not deign to explain how such a father could beget such a son. Why was it so remiss?

The truth is still unwelcome to Jews and "modernists," but Josephus must certainly have written that paragraph essentially as we have it. It probably has suffered the loss of two words; for good and sufficient reasons can be adduced for their disappearance, and they seem to belong to the passage in the days of Josephus but not in later centuries. Manuscript evidence for one of them still exists, and it inevitably suggests the second as a necessity. But not another thing is needed to explain the entire situation and the differences in the attitudes of the church fathers. Josephus recognized facts as such, did not fancy them, did not know what to make of them but could not dodge them and keep his word, and acted accordingly. That is all there is to it. His attitude was not that of a modern Jew or a gentile "modern-

ist," it was that of an ancient Jew familiar with the miracles of the Old Testament.

Before any "modernist" can make good any claim whatever to the effect that the passage in Josephus has been tampered with beyond the loss of two words as herein stated, he must first deal with the *Toldoth Jeshu* and explain how it is that a document so much later and one intended to discredit Jesus utterly nevertheless admits, not once but three or four times, that He raised the dead and cured lepers. Its inconsistencies have far less excuse than those of Josephus.

Though compiled from early sources, probably including the *Talmud*, it is a fairly late attempt to discredit Jesus and should therefore show some sensitiveness to the inconsistency of admitting his miracles so specifically, even adding to them in the bone matter, while defaming his birth so bitterly; but it does not even show a trace of any such thing and appears to consider the fiction of the use of *ha-Shem* as sufficient excuse for what happened. A bit of parchment with the Name on it, hidden beneath his skin by means of a cut, is thus given credit for sufficient potency to enable Him to put some dry bones together, clothe them with flesh, and make a live man of them!

If there is any inconsistency in the position of Josephus, what shall be said of the inconsistencies of this late document, which contains things so utterly at variance as miracles surpassing those of the New Testament performed by an outcast so low in the social scale because of his birth that he is beyond the pale? That is the true inwardness of the Jewish insult already explained.

The simple truth is this: the "modern mind" has no conception of the mentality of the ancient Jew and but little of that of the modern one. To ancient Jewish minds a fact was a fact regardless of what the "modern mind" considers fitting or consistent. If it was a fact, any explanation that would satisfy minds not too much given to questioning would be considered sufficient. Any one with the slightest knowledge of the subterfuges in the *Talmud*, which overthrow the plain meaning of the Biblical text without altering it, must certainly have some idea of the possibilities in this connection. The testimony of Jesus himself ought to help make the matter clear.

The restrictions of logic are modern, and the "modernists" are not modern in applying them to writings of the first century of our era. Such proceedings are the worst sort of

anachronisms, as a matter of fact, besides being totally blind to the differences between the "modern mind" and the ancient Hebrew one. The former is apt to be severely logical, even logically illogical when its premises are wrong, while the latter is without any such restriction. The former prefers straight lines in its thinking, while the latter abhors them. It delights in curves, in topical arrangements, and in a disregard of exact chronological order. It moves in a different sphere, and when the fact is once recognized, much that is puzzling in the Bible becomes clear.

As a matter of fact, Josephus ran true to type in writing as he did; for any other course would have been modern in effect, not ancient and Jewish. Our educational methods have made us different, and the modern Jew

is being changed in our schools to be more like us. He is still different in some ways; but he is showing the effect of his training more and more, and for that reason he cannot be as helpful to us as he might be otherwise. He will take the modern conception of *yôm* as it appears in Yiddish and give that as its meaning, whereas its ancient force was something utterly opposed to the sense it now has in Yiddish. There it means day in the modern sense. In Genesis it means an indefinite period of time, the daylight period in particular, which is about as indefinite as anything can be. "Every dog has his day" is similar. We need to divest ourselves of our own modern conceits and try to see things as a Jew of the first century would see them. We can then make some progress.

Belmont, Massachusetts

Jesus—The Son of a Virgin

REVEREND H. J. OCKENGA

THE sign of the virgin who should conceive and bear a son was first given to King Ahaz of Judah about 800 B.C. His kingdom had been invaded by Rezin, the king of Syria, and Remaliah, the king of Israel. To him the prophet Isaiah came with the promise that he should be delivered from his two enemies. In proof of it he was told to ask God for a sign, either in the depth or in the height above. But Ahaz pretended that he would not tempt God, and in unbelief refused to comply with the requests. The prophet Isaiah rebuked him and then gave a prophecy unto the whole house of David, which was that its enemies would ultimately be cut off, and it should be supreme with great triumph. The sign of this to the house of David was that a Virgin should conceive and bear a son, and call his name Emmanuel. It was a continuing promise addressed to the Davidic family, and accounts for the instant acceptance of the angel's promise by Mary.

Unbelievers have attacked this passage of Scripture as much as any other one passage because it was a prophecy made 800 years before the event, and because it dealt with that much controverted subject of the Virgin Birth. The point of attack on this verse is that the word "virgin" does not mean virgin in our sense, but that it means an unmarried maiden whether moral or immoral. It would be profitable to enter the lists against these

critics in defense of the true meaning of the word "virgin," but others far more capable have already performed this task. The late Robert Dick Wilson, master of forty-eight languages, has conclusively proved that this word may not only mean virgin, but that it must mean virgin from the other uses of it in the Scripture. Both the Hebrew use of it in every case in the Old Testament (when speaking of Rebecca before she was brought to Isaac and when speaking of the way of a man with an innocent maid) and the Greek, as the Hebrew is interpreted in the Septuagint, use this word exclusively as virgin. This prophecy of Isaiah was seized upon by Matthew when he related the appearance of the angel to Joseph revealing to him that his wife should be the virgin that should conceive. It is quite evident that the Bible teaches the Virgin Birth.

There are many today who say that it is a matter of no concern whether Jesus was born of a Virgin or not. They contend that it is a subordinate matter, and that a man can preach the same Gospel with or without it. But others say that it is a matter of supreme importance with which group we agree. The truth of the Virgin Birth has a stupendous bearing upon the authority of the Bible. Many seem to think that it is only a question of interpretation, but it is far more than that. It is a question of whether the Bible is true or not, for the Bible teaches it. If we give

up the Virgin Birth of Christ we must give up the authority and inspiration of the Bible. If this has crept into the Bible and is not a fact, one cannot hold to the truthfulness of the Bible.

It is also important as a test whether a man is holding to the supernatural or the naturalistic view of Christ. This is the central point of controversy in the Church today. It is a question of supernaturalism *versus* naturalism. When the naturalists speak of the deity of Christ they do not mean what we mean at all, but simply that Jesus is God as all are God, or that He is God in the sense that we see the highest moral life in Him, or in the sense that His teachings live on in others. When a man says that Jesus was born without a father he is put face to face with the question of the supernatural.

And, finally, it has a great bearing upon our knowledge of Jesus. Without the teaching of the Virgin Birth the thought life of the church would be very much impoverished. No matter how high an estimation one has of Christ it would be impossible to be as high without the belief in the Virgin Birth. This is clearly seen if you can imagine never having heard of it. To know it and to reject it is a different matter altogether.

THE Virgin Birth means that Jesus was born without a human father, having been conceived by the Holy Spirit. This is quite distinct from the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception which was made dogma by the Roman Church in the thirteenth century. The latter means that the Virgin Mary was conceived without sin. The Protestants attempt no such reinforcing of the teaching of the Virgin Birth. At the beginning we should remember that it is not a question of whether a man was born without a human father, but it is a question whether Jesus was so born.

This Virgin Birth was anticipated. It had been prophesied to the house of David centuries before it took place. The Emmanuel prophecies in the Book of Isaiah describe the child who was to be born as an extraordinary individual. If his birth were in the ordinary way it would not have been a sign. It was also to be like a root springing out of dry ground. The Child also was to be extraordinary. The same words are used of Him that are used of the eternal God. He is called the Almighty God, the Everlasting Father, and the Prince of Peace. This anticipation which ran through

the Davidic house was seized upon by Mary in her quick assent to the angelic annunciation, by Elizabeth in her salutation to the soon-to-be-mother, by Joseph in his compliance with the Divine command, and by the narrators who record the event as a fulfillment of prophecy.

No one has ever doubted that the Bible in its present form teaches the Virgin Birth. The Virgin Birth is recorded in two of the Gospels: in Matthew and in Luke. Immediately one wonders about the trustworthiness of these narratives. In a university class just one month ago I heard a professor tell how easily the beginning and the ending of a book could become mutilated, and then reconstructed by someone else. He then slurringly remarked that this was what probably happened to the Books of Matthew and of Luke in their narration of the Virgin Birth.

Let us look, then, at these narratives. Luke is accepted by the most critical scholars, hostile to Christianity, as a reliable and painstaking historian. He is the author of the double work Luke-Acts. The period dealt with by the Book of Acts is the most complicated period of Roman history, and yet, though Luke dealt with many cities, countries, provinces, legates, rulers, and individuals, there has not been found one error in the whole record of the Book of Acts.

Now, by common consent this painstaking historian was also the author of the Book of Luke. What is more, in his introduction he specifically states that he is approaching this subject upon a scientific basis, having investigated all of the sources that were available at that age, which was about the middle of the first century.

It is admitted that Luke used sources. No doubt, they were either Aramaic or Hebrew, for immediately after his introduction the style of the narrative changes from the flowing Greek to the abrupt Hebrew, showing that Luke incorporated his sources without change into his historical narrative. That this narrative belongs there is admitted by hostile critics. But an attack has been made upon four verses which definitely state that Jesus was born of a Virgin. The story of the birth of John and of the annunciation to Mary is all admitted, but the phrases dealing directly with the supernatural character of the Child are expurgated by these unbelievers.

The question arises as to whether they are right or wrong. After carefully examining the arguments on both sides I see no reason

for expunging these statements from the narrative.

We find, first, the whole narrative is written in a high key. It is pitched at an elevated tension. There is the story of the annunciation to the shepherds, the angel's visit to Zacharias, the message of Gabriel to Mary, and the vision to Joseph. There is the story of Simeon and Anna, and the glorious hymns of the magnificat and the benedictus. If there was no Virgin Birth the whole story would be without a point. It would fall flat.

Secondly, there is an interesting and astonishing parallel in the story of the birth of John the Baptist and birth of Christ. Remember that the unbelieving critics admit the truth and the integrity of the narrative of John and about the annunciation to Mary.

Now notice how the parallel would break down if these verses dealing with the Virgin Birth were omitted. Zacharias, while performing the sacrifice in the temple received a vision of the angel of the Lord at which he was troubled. Mary at Nazareth saw the angel Gabriel who said that she should have a son, and she was troubled.

Zacharias was told by the angel to fear not, and the exact words were repeated to Mary. The reason given to Zacharias was that his prayer was heard, that is, his life-long prayer for a child. The reason given to Mary was that she was highly favored and had found favor with God.

The promise given to Zacharias was that Elizabeth his wife should conceive; the promise given to Mary was that she should conceive a son. Zacharias was then told of the greatness of his child who should go before the Christ and prepare his way. Mary was told of the greatness of her Child who should be the Son of God, and should rule on the throne of David.

Zacharias doubted the angel's promise because of his age and demanded a reason for it. Mary questioned it because of the delicacy of the matter since she was still unmarried. Zacharias' doubt caused a reiteration of the promise, and the giving of a sign which was his dumbness, a punishment for unbelief. Mary received the reiteration of the promise and the sign which was that she should find her cousin Elizabeth was to have a son.

On these seven points the story is a literary parallel. Now, to say that the last three sections of that parallel which are written about Christ did not belong in the original narrative but were inserted later by one attempting to foist the belief in the Virgin

Birth upon this story makes the whole construction fall down. Either the whole narrative must necessarily be a forgery or none of it.

The whole point of it is that Jesus was to be a greater child in every way than John the Baptist, and if this statement about the Virgin Birth is taken out, the capstone is gone. If it were possible that a later redactor interpolated these words he must have had the insight of a genius which is comparable to inspiration.

THE rest of the New Testament assumes the Virgin Birth. Paul mentions very little about the life of Christ in his writings, and many things are omitted that we receive from other sources. But the type of Christ that he preached was the Christ who was both God and man, and who, though being in the form of man, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.

The Acts of the Apostles does not speak of the Virgin Birth, and the reason for this is manifest. It is a missionary book and the Virgin Birth is not an apologetic doctrine which can be preached when attempting to win a man to Christianity. It follows after one has been won.

Mark does not mention it because his narrative starts with the public ministry of Christ and also is a missionary book.

John specifically teaches the deity of Christ, but is silent on many of the things of His life, such as His temptation in the wilderness, His Sermon on the Mount, His institution of the Lord's Supper, and His ascension into heaven. Are we to infer that because he is silent upon these subjects that they never occurred?

But Matthew has much to say about this subject. He tells us items of interest that are not recorded in Luke, such as the visit of the Magi. These stories are not meant to be interwoven, but they are recorded from two different standpoints, that in Matthew no doubt was the written tradition from Joseph, and that in Luke the oral tradition related by Mary at the auspicious time of Pentecost when the disciples were ready to receive it. No doubt Joseph died early since he is not mentioned after the twelfth year of Christ, and thus the matter would be kept a secret until the time the disciples were prepared to receive it. It is not necessary to believe that the knowledge of the shepherds and the Magi and Simeon and Anna reached

a very large circle. Thus we conclude that the Bible clearly teaches the Virgin Birth of Christ.

This also was a fact accepted by the Christians of the second century as it has been accepted ever since. We have concrete proof in the writings of the Fathers, of the Apologists, and of the Apostolic Fathers that they believed in the Virgin Birth.

Irenaeus, born 115 A.D., who was the student of Polycarp, who in turn was the disciple of John the Beloved, held the belief in the Virgin Birth and the general acceptance of it in his day.

Another early second century writer who accepted it was Justin Martyr who states that Jesus was the Son of God, the first born of every creature, born through a virgin, and crucified under Pontius Pilate.

The Apostles' Creed states the belief in the Virgin Birth, and the earliest form of it contains this statement about 100 A.D.

Ignatius who was martyred at 110 A.D. mentions in his Syrian epistle that the Virgin Birth was an accepted fact.

From these statements it is clear to us that the belief in the sign of Emmanuel, that is, that a Virgin should conceive and bear a son was anticipated in the Old Testament, actually experienced according to the New Testament, and was accepted by the earliest writers of Christianity.

WHEN Simeon prophesied concerning the future of this Child, he said that he should be a sign spoken against, and surely this sign of a virgin has been spoken against. Many of the objections which we call modern, and which form stumbling blocks for us today were advanced by pagan and Jewish unbelievers in the second and third centuries.

In the middle of the second century, Justin Martyr wrote his platonic dialogue versus Trypho. It was probably a fictitious creation of a man holding the arguments of the Jews which were advanced against Christianity. In this dialogue Trypho refuses to accept the Virgin Birth but he gives no alternative for it.

In the middle of the third century Origen writes against the pagan critic named Celsus. Celsus had written in 180 A.D., and his writings are lost except as they are quoted by Origen who gives us about four-fifths of the writings of Celsus word for word. He claimed that Penthera, a Roman soldier, was the father of Jesus. This same story also

appears in the Talmud and in mediaeval Jewish writing, the Poldoth Jeshu.

What about this story? Is it historical? The universal opinion of scholars hostile to Christianity is that the story is fiction. It cannot be traced farther back than 180 A.D. If this tradition had existed before that time, why didn't the other earlier exponents of Christianity say something about it? It is manifestly a late creation.

There was another source of denial in those early days by some professing Christians who held to fanatical doctrines. The docetists believed that Jesus was not truly born at all but was merely a phantom. And the ultra-Paulinists believed that Jesus appeared on earth a full grown man. And then there were some who believed that Jesus was born from Joseph and Mary.

From this summary of the most ancient attacks upon the Virgin Birth we can readily see that our so-called "Modernists" have not much that is modern.

There are other objections, however, which are of more modern origin. One is that the idea of a Virgin Birth is a pagan derivation, that is, that there are parallels in pagan literature of Virgin Births. Perses was supposed to have a human mother and a divine father but he was a mythological character.

An historical character about whom the story of a Virgin Birth is propagated is Plato. Diogenes Laertius claims on the basis of three authorities that Plato was born from the god Apollo. Alexander the Great was supposed to have been born from Zeus.

It must be said, however, that the exalted view of the Virgin Birth as presented in the Bible and the Christian Church could never have originated from the pagan crass analogies. They were too far removed from them, and the Scriptural doctrine has a closer antecedent in the prophecy of Isaiah and in the facts.

Another consideration against such a derivation of the idea is that it would necessarily have to be injected into the narrative at a late date or have found its way into the source which Luke used. The former we found to be impossible from a study of the narratives and the theory of interpolation. The latter is impossible because the strict monotheistic Jews would never make room for such a theory before it had happened as a fact. Many scholars seeing the weakness of this argument are now attempting to turn to Oriental sources for the idea.

Another modern objection is that the Davidic descent of Jesus is traced in both genealogies through Joseph and not through Mary, thus making Joseph the father of Jesus. This objection forgets that Joseph was the legal father of Jesus, and that Mary herself applied this term to him when they sought the lost Jesus sorrowing. What is more, the Roman Catholic exegetes believe that the Lukan narrative traces the genealogy of Mary who was the daughter of Eli to whom Joseph was a son by marriage. This seems a little forced though it may be true, and it is better to hold that Jesus was legally the son of Joseph who was the son of David, and the prophecy was fulfilled in that way.

That the genealogies are different from David to Christ simply shows that one traces the kingly descent and the other the physical. It must also be remembered that the two genealogies were written from different standpoints; one from Joseph's; one from Mary's.

Our modern critics have stated that a Virgin Birth is biologically impossible. In answer to that we can only say that what we call natural generation is really supernatural. No one can tell whence that life comes when a new child is born into the world. The answer that Gabriel gave to Mary when she said, "How can this be?" is also ours, "With God nothing shall be impossible."

One may wonder why if Mary knew of the Virgin Birth that she should not have related it earlier to substantiate the claims of Christ, but that is easily seen due to the delicacy of her nature. It says again and again that she pondered these things in her heart. Though conscious of the greatness of her child she knew not until Calvary how His work was to be fulfilled, and then she said nothing until the disciples were empowered with the Holy Ghost at Pentecost and shared her faith. We must remember that Mary was a devout, simple Jewish maid who was filled with wonder at the workings of God. If it seems that she failed at times to comprehend the greatness of her privilege we ought to remember that some of the most intellectual men have failed to comprehend this same great teaching. Yes, it was a sign spoken against then and spoken against now, but it was a fact that actually took place, for no other alternative is able to be accounted for as an explanation for the belief of the church.

WHAT value to us has all this argument for the Virgin Birth? The same that it

had for Ahaz, for the house of David, for the mother of our Lord, and for the Christians of the centuries, that is, that God is with us. Jesus proved Himself to be the Son of God in His life. If we took the Virgin Birth alone and attempted to accept it, the great presumption of it all would be against it. Yet when we see Him in the whole New Testament picture with His miracles, with His sinless life, with His glorious teachings, with His substitutionary death upon the Cross for the forgiveness of sins, with His resurrection from the dead, and His ascension into heaven, and His power that has been manifested in the hearts and lives of Christians throughout the ages, then we know that the Virgin Birth is true.

We have admitted the supernatural at the Resurrection which can be definitely proved, and if this extraordinary Being conquered death, sin, and the grave, surely He was different from any other man. The Resurrection gives the logical proof for the Virgin Birth. By its own testimony the doctrine could not stand, but taken with the others it is a composite whole.

This Emmanuel was God, equal with the Father, begotten from eternity, claiming deity while on earth, identifying himself with Jehovah, manifesting God the Father unto man. He was God's representative.

Emmanuel was man. He was the son of a Virgin who was a woman born as any other individual was born. From her He received flesh, body and blood, such as we possess that He might be tempted as we are tempted, suffer as we suffer, sorrow as we sorrow, endure loneliness, hate, prejudice, and need, and yet be without sin. He was the perfect representative of the human race. He had in Him the nature of man, and the nature of God, and yet He was one person. Many times in the Bible we find illustrations of this; sometimes he spake as man, saying that no man knoweth the hour of the Second Coming, not even the Son of man. And again He acted on His authority as God in multiplying the bread so as to feed five thousand, in raising the dead, and in healing the sick. As man He was weary, and rested by the well of Samaria, as God He was transfigured upon the mount.

This God-man is the Saviour of the world. The Virgin Birth thus becomes an absolute necessity for man's salvation. He must have been born of the flesh in order to represent true humanity. He must have been conceived by the Holy Ghost to represent true deity

that He might atone for the sins of all men. In him were two natures but He was one person, and through that person there was infused hope and grace into the human race, while through Him also there was accomplished a complete satisfaction of the laws of the nature of God.

Through him then alone can man be saved, for this incarnation was the only way that sin could be removed from the world. And through faith in that Son of God who breaks the power of passion, and lifts the burden of past iniquity, one comes to find the greatest argument and proof for the Virgin Birth. Some one says, "Do you base your faith in the Virgin Birth on your intellectual knowledge?" And I can only answer, "No, I know

Jesus Christ, and hence I know that He was born of a Virgin." Likewise, it is not necessary for one to believe in the Virgin Birth to become a Christian, but after he becomes a Christian, I am confident that he will believe that Jesus was Emmanuel, God with us, the sign of the ages, the man who was born of the Holy Spirit, and of a Virgin.

"Behold, I bring you glad tidings of great joy, for unto you is born a Saviour in the city of Bethlehem, Christ the Lord." Through that message of the Gospel salvation has come to many, peace to the souls of men, and some day peace will come among all men. Glory to God in the highest, peace on earth among men!

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

The Glory of the Christian Religion

PROFESSOR LYNN HAROLD HOUGH, Th.D., D.D., LL.D.

PROSPERITY has a way of breeding pessimists. Tragic circumstances often give birth to men of glowing and lyrical optimism. And so we are not entirely surprised at Ezekiel. The city had been overthrown and its walls broken down. The glorious temple lay in ruins. The people had been deported, and solaced their lonely hearts as best they could in a distant land. As long as they had fed illusion with false hopes Ezekiel had been a stern and remorseless prophet of gloom. But now that the worst has come, now that all the false foundations have crumbled, Ezekiel begins to tell of a structure soundly built which shall withstand all the destructive forces of time and circumstance. He sees a restored people. He sees a rebuilt city. He sees a glorious temple once more standing splendidly upon the heights. He has honestly set forth the worst which could be thought and said. Now from the very heart of the worst he brings forth the best. And the climax of his triumphant faith is his vision of the life-giving stream flowing from the sanctuary, dashing downward to the Dead Sea, bringing life everywhere, sweetening the waters of the Dead Sea so that they swarm with fish, filling waste land with trees whose exhaustless fruit provides food for men and whose very leaves heal their diseases. So the greatest churchman of Israel saw the glory of the Church even in decadent days.

The Christian Church, we like to say, is the consummation and the flower of all the

wistful hopes which are found in the Old Testament life. If this is true the Christian Church ought triumphantly to rise to the occasion when dark and decadent days make hopeful words difficult. The vision of the glory of the Church ought to shine most resplendent just when the temple seems to lie in ruins.

There is no doubt about the world-wide gloom. And difficult as are external conditions the inner disease is even more tragic. For civilization has ceased to believe in itself. Philip Guedalla said of the period of Disraeli that at that time men were in the habit of casting mother-of-pearl before swine. A good many men are inclined now to say that in the period just before us men were busy casting false pearls before real swine. With mordant honesty we have analyzed the swine. And if we have left any faith in man's outreach after goodness it is in spite of the very valiant efforts of men like James Joyce and D. H. Lawrence.

In the midst of all this no words have been bitter enough to express men's ugly disillusionment in respect of the Christian Church. From every hand the attack has come. And in the presence of the onrush of an angry generation, filled with a very lust of hatred, the Church has almost been afraid to call its soul its own. The suggestion of a larger Christian fulfilment of Ezekiel's ancient vision of healing waters coming from the Sanctuary, so that even dead seas shall be changed to sweet and life-sustaining waters,

has seemed too absurd for consideration.

All this, however, is the result of making angry emotion a substitute for thought. That the emotions of an age, weary and irritable and caught in the clutches of bitter reaction, have tried the Church and have found it wanting is true enough. That critical intelligence has tried the Church and has decided against its claims is simply untrue. There has been no true trial. And, therefore, there has been no true verdict. And when we begin to analyze the tale of the life of the Church with a clear use of the instruments of intelligence and an insistently honest use of our judgment we are fairly amazed at the case which the Church can make for itself.

A few years ago Mr. Chesterton and Mr. Blatchford had a controversy along lines which in certain ways ran parallel to our discussion. Mr. Blatchford had made bitter mirth in dealing with the mistakes—and worse—of the Church and with some pride had referred to the cleaner record of Atheism. Then the leonine wrath of Mr. Chesterton broke forth, and said in effect:

Yes, there are dark pages in the history of the Christian Church. For centuries it was the supreme power in the world. It tamed the Barbarians. It created modern Europe. It gave power to the very wheels of civilization. Of course, working on so grand a scale it made great mistakes. On the other hand Atheism has no history. It has never built an institution. It has never created a culture. It has never sat upon a throne from which it has mastered the forces which have made an epoch. It has never really done anything. And because it has no great history it has no record of great mistakes.

Suppose we admit the dark and deplorable pages in the history of the Church, its weaknesses, its mistakes and even its crimes. And then suppose we look with complete honesty upon its positive contribution to the life of the world, its moral vigor, its spiritual splendor, its social potency, its intellectual energy, and its relation to the higher statesmanship of the world. Even a cursory survey will make it possible for us to speak very proudly of the glory of the Church. Healing waters have indeed come forth from the sanctuary for the renewal of the life of man.

The Church in the Roman Empire

The first amazing thing about the Church is just its capacity to make a place for itself in the life of the rotting Roman Empire and to do this by the sheer force of moral and spiritual power.

From a little province on the edge of the Mediterranean it emerges and, with a quiet

power, suffuses the vast body politic—a hundred million population all about the great sea—with a new spirit and a new quality of life. Selfish people become unselfish, unclean people become clean, the most licentious cities of the Empire suddenly find the white flower of a blameless life blooming in the midst of their debauchery. A terrible plague comes to a city like Alexandria. Children in mad panic forsake their parents, husbands forsake their wives, and parents forsake their children. The Christians remain dauntlessly caring for the sick and giving decent burial to the dead. Slaves are so transformed in character that their masters look on in amazement. Romans were accustomed to owning men of genius. Epictetus was a slave. But for a Roman to wake up and find that he owned a group of saints was a new experience. The fact was so new that a new word had to be provided for it. Simple people who were carried about the world by the winds of trade and the power of swiftly changing circumstance became Christians and the contagion of their sweet unselfishness and steel-like strength went with them everywhere.

One stainless figure with a heart of exhaustless compassion had captured the imagination and mastered the conscience of unnumbered multitudes all about the world. Rome began to fear this almost invisible and widely potent spiritual power. But Rome was large minded and inclined on its own terms to be tolerant. If these Christians would only worship the Emperor and acknowledge the imperial cult they could have their religion. For really Rome's only Church was a State.

But this was just what the Christians could not do. All that man could attain, all that God could be, they had found in Christ. And they could admit no claim which put another figure on a level with Him. They could not accept for Christ a place in the Roman pantheon. He must have an unshared throne. So the centuries of persecution began. And right royally slave and nobleman, scholar and tradesman met the test.

At last it became a strange race to see whether Rome could kill Christians as fast as the Church could win new converts. And the Church won. All the prestige and organization and far-reaching power of the Empire flung itself helplessly against the sheer moral and spiritual vitality of the Christian Church. And at last a great Roman, always a shrewd politician and sometimes a man on whom the splendor of the spiritual life flash-

ed, saw that the time had come for the Roman eagle to make terms with the figure which hung upon the Cross. And so the Empire became Christian. Is there any story like it in the history of man? Here, at least, the life which was in the Church proved the most powerful force in the world. The waters flowing from the sanctuary had indeed become a great sea.

The Christian Conquest of the Mind

But the Church knew how to capture man's mind as well as how to master his conscience. The fashion in which the great Alexandrians used the sanctions of Greek philosophy as a bridge to carry the mind of man to Christ remains one of the intellectual feats of the ancient world.

Men like Clement and Origen were actually ready to claim the whole mental life of man for the rule of Christ, to command the resources of the most acute of Attic minds for the purpose of interpreting the sanctions of the Christian religion.

Plato found himself unexpectedly in the company of Isaiah as a father of the mighty spiritual impulses which found fulfilment in the religion of the Nazarene.

The wistful spiritual hopes of Virgil were caught into the sweep of the movement towards Christ. He was the captain of the mind as well as the king of the heart and the lord of the conscience. The whole subtle movement of Greek thought was made the servant of a Christian interpretation of the universe and of life.

From Justin Martyr, who always wore his philosopher's cloak even as a Christian teacher, to the great North African who dominated the thought of Europe for a thousand years and was well called the schoolmaster of the Middle Ages, the yeast of a quickened mental life moved like quicksilver among the best minds of the Church who soon came to be the best minds of the world.

The Augustine who, as Rome the City of Man fell, wrote *De Civitate Dei*, and with his interpretation of the City of God achieved the first great philosophy of history, proved with what regal a quality the sons of the Church could move in the high places of the mind.

When the twelfth century came it was a son of the Church, Abelard, who wrote that astonishing book *Sic et Non*, and lifted the flag of a shrewd and observant criticism in the Church itself. And in the thirteenth century criticism and creative thinking were

combined as they have rarely been combined in the history of human thought in the *Summa* of Saint Thomas.

All the thoughts of men, all the experiences of men, and all the facts of life are now seen as material for one great and mastering synthesis dominated by the mighty figure of Jesus Christ. And when lusty and all too lustful young nations are trying to find their way to some sort of order and coherence, it is in the name of the Christian sanctions that Dante writes his great Latin work *De Monarchia*. In the best thought of the thirteenth century political principles, social sanctions, individual experiences, moral imperatives and spiritual realities were made part of one great and complete view of life and destiny.

When in the Divine Comedy all of it was made splendid poetry, the philosophy of Aristotle, the ethical experience of the Old Testament, the spiritual victory of the New, the deep humanism of the classics, the transcendent revelation of the Christian religion, the history of many a vagrant and many a glorious century, the theology of Thomas Aquinas, and the earlier pulse beat of a passion which was to become the Renaissance, all came together expressed in words of deathless loveliness and set against a background as majestic as the character and the power and love of God.

How petty most modern writing seems when compared with the Alpine quality of a masterpiece which was essentially a Christian interpretation of life. The waters from the sanctuary flowing through places of tragic desolation were indeed making the desert to blossom as a rose.

The Apostles of the Church

The Christian religion has always had a way of providing the dauntless apostle to carry its good news to the places where the promises and hopes it brought were indeed news in the very literal sense of not having been heard before. There is always a Columba ready for some new Iona. There is always a Boniface waiting for the wildness of some strange German forests. There is always a Gregory looking at fair faced strangers and saying "Not Angles but angels" and sending some Augustine to a distant island to save its people from the wrath of God.

From the days when Paul made the Mediterranean world his parish to the days when Livingstone with his own marching feet,

going East and West and North and South, made a great cross upon the continent of Africa, the heroic messenger has always been ready to set off for the land of the sunrise or the land of the sunset that good hearts, and good will may be the gift of God's grace to all the world.

The boy of my own schooldays who used to bend eager eyes upon the seal of his own missionary society—an ox standing between a plough and an altar with the words underneath "ready to serve or to be offered up"—and who himself made the great sacrifice at the hands of fierce and angry men early in his missionary career, touches hands with the aged Polycarp of Smyrna across the centuries.

The red line of sacrifice has glorified all the Christian centuries. And how these martyrs have given to the world the gift of shining faces. In the presence of death they are so incredibly sure of God, and sure of man's response to God's love, and sure of the Church's victory, and sure of a glorious immortality. The listless idlers have always been masters of doubt. The martyrs have always conducted a school of faith. We cannot forget them. We cannot ignore them. We cannot live as if they had never lived. We cannot die as if they had never died. That the world has not been worthy of them does not excuse us. The world must be made worthy of them. There are always clear-eyed young men who catch their vision, there are always young spirits of whom God cannot ask too much. And the rest of us must at least reverence the glory which shines in their faces, and gives loyalty to the faith for which they die.

The blood of the martyrs cries to us from the ground that we shall not be disloyal to a cause which was dearer to them than life. To sap the life of a great movement by cynical disbelief is a crime so evil that for it we have no word. But whatever we do, the men and women of dauntless sacrifice have watered the earth with something more than their tears. And they, least of all, would have reason to blush were they to confront the stern demand of Ezekiel's vision of the healing waters flowing from the sanctuary.

The Church as the Conscience of the World

In the most notable fashion the Church has been the conscience of the world. And this is a tale which only volumes of careful narrative could tell. In one of these volumes you would see a monk, who felt the torment

of a Christian conscience in the presence of a gladiatorial combat, go springing between the contestants, and soon lost his life—but at that price bringing gladiatorial combats to an end. In many of these volumes you would see the Church looking with anxious and tortured eyes at human slavery until the death warrant of that traffic was pronounced through forces set in motion by the conscience which the Church had given to the world.

The fashion in which human values have taken a higher and higher place and property values have been more and more seen in the light of human meanings, is a tale of influence of forces released by the Church. Men like Maurice and Kingsley help us to understand the way in which the Church has cradled the men who have given the noblest sort of social conscience to the world. That men are uneasy in the presence of a thousand wrongs they would like to ignore or tolerate and from which they would even like to profit is the outcome of an attitude toward life which is the product of Christian training. And once and again the battlers for a better social order, even when they are not churchmen, are investing a moral capital which the Church has put into their hands.

No wrong is securely on the throne when the moral life of the Christian Church runs deep and true. And no right is safely slighted where the Church exists. For even when the Church is asleep it is haunted by dreams of a righteous world. The beloved community is first of all a prophetic dream, then a Christian hope, and the unappeasable moral expectation upon which that hope is based is kept alive in the world by forces which come from the Christian Church.

The Church in the Modern World

Then, the Church has manifested a remarkable capacity for self-criticism. No other human institution has equalled its power to produce its most effective critics from within its own life. The Protestant revolt is just the outstanding example of a force forever at work. The Church is perpetually producing fierce young men who publicly repent of its errors and scourge it for its sins. And even when it does not occur to them that their fervor of condemnation is made possible by the very institution whose evils they are castigating, they are the gift of the Church to the period in which they live. There is a yeast of moral and social passion which the Church is perpetually putting into

the dull mass of life. And the living power of this heaven is the most noteworthy energy in producing discontent with evil and a passionate desire for the good.

The Church in the Modern World

And in our own day the Church has much reason to take courage. If as Paul Valéry, the great French critic, has suggested, the defining characteristic of the modern world is the existence in the same mind of contradictory ideas and incompatible desires, this very state of restless anarchy has come to exist as men have ignored the witness of the Church to sanctions which would have given unity and harmony to our distraught and broken world.

It is not by loyalty to the truths to which the historic Church has borne witness that the world has fallen upon these evil days. And such brilliant and searching thinkers as Jacques Maritain have all the weight of evidence on their side when they recall us to the sanctions which lie deepest in the life of twenty centuries of Christian history for the healing of the disease which afflicts the world.

The movement of searchingly critical minds toward the historic Christian position is today a matter of great significance. I will not speak of the fashion in which the developments in physics in recent years have disturbed the equilibrium of a materialism which some regarded as completely triumphant. The really critical minds did not wait for the new physics in order to judge an assertive materialism. As Sir James Jeans has handsomely admitted, the positions to which the new physics moves are not dissimilar to those of Bishop Berkeley. And in any event the Christian positions stand in their own right and not by permission of some human activity which covers the purely material aspects of human experience. It is rather more important that men who know the whole human story best and have surveyed it with most critical attention should find themselves moving toward positions the Church has made the center of its witness.

That a man like Dr. Paul Elmer More, whose erudition is perhaps unsurpassed in the English speaking world, should move from his vast and varied humanism to a new study of Greek philosophy and Plato and then to the New Testament and the Church fathers, to Nicæa and Chalcedon, and come to the very belief in the Incarnation which has been the pivotal assertion of the historic Church, points the way which men of equal

erudition and equal critical acumen are likely to take.

But the perpetual witness of a quiet multitude which no man can number, to the vitality and the adequacy of the message which the Christian Church brings to the world, gives a new assurance in difficult days that the stream which flows from the sanctuary even now is doing its work far more potently than we may have supposed.

But if the picture of the streams of water flowing from the temple is in part glorious history it is in notable part high prophecy. There are still desert places waiting for this tremendous irrigation. There are still Dead Seas waiting for the cleansing and renewing streams. And if we are worthy successors of those who made faith a splendid and creative thing in other days we will go forward with confident expectation and zestful faith to the greater glory which the Christian Church is to give to the life of man in the years which lie ahead.

Madison, New Jersey.

We Behold His Glory

DAVID JAMES BURRELL, D.D., LL.D.

John 1:14

JOHN saw the glory of Christ. Mary knew her son Jesus was more than an ordinary man; she kept this secret in her heart. Not one of the disciples seemed fully to believe on him, but the great truth came ultimately to them all. We cannot see the divine glory. No man has ever seen God and lived, but until Christ came the Shechinah was a visible token of His real presence.

Of all the procession of the mighties who have passed by, not one has wholly escaped the twilight of oblivion save this carpenter of Nazareth. What is His glory that gives unchallenged preeminence to Jesus over all the earth today?

It is not the glory of an illustrious birth, nor the glory of power yet all power was given to Him. Was it His extraordinary goodness? Here indeed He stood solitary and alone. He claimed to be very God of very God. His claim was verified at His birth; His baptism; His transfiguration; His death; His resurrection; His ascension, and at pentecost. His coming to earth was to show the grace of God (John 3:16), and the word truth, here, characterizes our Lord's devotion to this work. The story of His work in our behalf is finding its way to the hearts of the children of men.

God—and the Philosophers

C. H. BUCHANAN, D.D.

TO every true Christian it should be said: "Thy God is thy glory!"

The philosophers in applying their finite methods to analyzing an infinite God, have always gotten into trouble. They feel that a Supreme Being, a great First Cause, is a necessity; but they seem not to have learned the limitations of human thinking. They each get into confusion when they attempt to define God, and say things, as Spencer does, that are profoundly meaningless.

One of the "bridges of difficulty" at which they all balk, is the reconciling an infinite God with an inexorable law. If God be infinite, can He be made subject to universal law? Is God a slave to His own laws? Can the Infinite Mind resort to reasoning, or planning for the future? Problems of this kind will confront the philosopher.

To appreciate the predicament such men may get into, we need to take but one example,—that from a very pleasing writer, Dr. J. W. Lee, in discussing the *Immortality of Man*. He says:

In starting with a self-conscious, self-determining and personal God . . . we are but beginning with a first principle, implied in the facts of nature and the nature of man. . . . The ground of the self-conscious, self-determining God is thought. That the fundamental and first thing in the universe is mind; that the being of God is secondary to the mind or thought of God. God has being because He has thought, and not thought because He has being. The trouble with the pantheistic system of Spinoza was that he looked upon God as infinite substance or being, while thought was only one of the modes of His being and extension another. . . . Many speak of God as the Supreme Being, and advertise by their language that their estimate of God is diffused nebulously. No skeptic ever came to the notion that God is primarily and essentially thought. We may properly speak of His being, His wisdom, justice, truth and love; but these are but different determinations of His thought (*The Making of a Man*, p.345).

This we recognize as an echo of Hegelian philosophy; and while it may seem novel, is it true? Such an idea of God may seem axiomatic but will it bear close scrutiny? Will it stand up under the burden of the laws of logical thought?

Now, there are but two meanings to be given to the word "thought:" the *power* of thinking and the *product* of an active faculty.

Which of these definitions will make plain the philosopher's idea of God? When he says

"God has being because he has thought," does he mean that God's thinking faculty had priority to his being? Or does he mean that God's great body of thought had existence prior to His own existence? In either case we land in confusion.

Our philosopher's language reads very much like making *thought* a substance, an eternal entity existing prior to any thinking faculty of God, which to us is unthinkable. Surely he does not intend to say that God is an infinite embodiment of non-generated thought, and because of this fact He has existence. Yet how else can there be any meaning in his statement, that "God is primarily, fundamentally thought,"—all other attributes being secondary.

Thought implies an active producing personality. Non-generated thought is a mere matter of words, a refinement of folly.

If God must be conceived of, first of all, as "fundamentally and essentially thought," are we not driven to assign to Him existence manifested by no characteristic feature, a conception constituted by nothing conceivable? Surely God is not quite so nebulous as that.

The Meaning of "Because"

To ascertain just what our philosopher is trying to say, one must first know in what sense he uses his words. Now, when he says: "God has being *because* He has Thought," one must know the exact shade of meaning he gives to the word "because." Here again we are confronted with a dual meaning. (1) A reason for, on account of, *i. e.*; He slept because he was weary. Here weariness is the producing fact of sleep. Then there is (2) another meaning, *in order that, to the end*, assignment of a purpose, *i. e.* He came because spring is here. Now, spring was the occasion rather than the cause of the event.

Can we by taking either of these meanings to "because," see daylight in the statement that "God has existence because He has thought?" In the first case, the meaning would be that God had being by reason of His having thought. In this case the meaning would be that God's thought was the casual agency of his existence. This would place His thought in priority to His existence,—which is absurd.

In the (2) meaning one must write that, "God has thought in order that He might exist,"—assigning a purpose for existence. But can we say, God *thought* that he might exist? But this does not relieve the difficulty in the least. We cannot conceive of the *thought* of God existing prior to his own existence, nor of one producing the other. We cannot conceive of a thoughtless God, or of His being as secondary to His thought. God's being could not have been conditioned on His thought.

It is as beautiful as it is true, that, "God's justice, truth, love and wisdom, are determinations of his thought." God's wisdom is His thought devising means to an end; His truth is His thought revealing itself; His love is His thought revealed in social fellowship and in sacrifice. Here we have charmingly set forth determination of the Divine thought; but these statements do not settle the priority of either God's being or His thought. The whole question is a mere quibble. God's existence and his thought are co-existent. Neither can exist without the other, either in time or in importance.

The "Externality" of God's Thought

Our philosopher makes his greatest break when he says that: "The being of God is the externality of His thought." At first glance this may seem to have a meaning; but when we come to apply the idea of "externality" to an omnipresent Being the break is seen.

Now, "externality" means an outward expression of one's thoughts, or one's thoughts put into definite form. When God thinks his ideas into existence we have "externality." A man, the moon, the universe are embodiments of the externality of God's thought. Such thoughts are thrilling to conceive.

But, when one says that God's existence is the externality of his thought, one must ask: Can God be outside of Himself? Can the infinite God externalize Himself; if so, where? "Externality" is a term in nowise applicable to the existence of God; it smacks too much of materialism. One dare not try to conceive of the separation of God from His thinking mind, or the externality of the infinite Being or His localization in space as a fixed habitation; otherwise we have pantheism.

The Logical Order of Thought

In all sane thinking there is a recognized order of thought. In this order substance comes before attributes. Says Dean Mansel,

Attributes are the attributes of a Substance. The former are conceived of as being derived; the latter as dependent and derived. Yet, in the order of time it is impossible to think of the divine Substance as existing before its attributes, or the attributes before the Substance. We cannot conceive of a being, wholly, simple, originally, developing in the course of time into complexity of attributes. Nor can we conceive of attributes existing prior to the Substance. For the very conception of attributes implies relation to Substance (*Limits of Religious Thought*, p.166).

The natural order of thought concerning God is this: (1) Existence, (2) Activity, life, (3) Self-consciousness, mind, thought, (4) Energy, implying objective relations. There could have been no creation without Energy; no energy without Mind or will; no will without Self-consciousness; and no Self-consciousness without Being. Back of all stands the first principle,—Existence.

In all of our theorizing about God it is well to remember that God is infinite while man is finite, and our positive knowledge about Him is limited. We must speak of Him negatively,—saying what He is not. "God is a Spirit, and has not a form like man." But our positive assertions must be few and guarded. Even Voltaire could see that, "it is extravagant to define God." "Extravagant" meaning exceeding reason. We should use words sparingly in speaking of Him. None of the great philosophers save themselves from confusion in theorizing about the divine Being. Neither Plato, Spinoza, Kant, DesCartes, nor Herbert Spencer leaves a clear ray of light behind him. The Infinite cannot be demonstrated by the finite, and one's words about Him must of necessity be inadequate. Well may we ponder the wise words of one who said:

Dangerous were it for the feeble mind of man to wade too deeply into the doings of the Most High. . . . Our safest eloquence concerning Him is silence, when we confess without confusion that His nature is inexplicable, His glory above our capacity to reach.

The philosophic or pagan ideas of God lead to confusion. Plato's conception of God was a *deification of the Ideal*,—man, laws, republic,—possible only to the philosopher.

With Spinoza God had two dimensions, *existence* and *extension*. This landed him in pantheism. Bayle held him up to his readers as a "systematic atheist." Others called him "the God-intoxicated man."

With Locke *God was all law*, and there was no mental freedom. This led to predetermined fixedness, if not to skepticism.

With Descartes God was *the great De-*

signer, the "carpenter-God" and "all the world, everybody, is a machine." This leads to Mechanism, if not to fatalism. It makes God the author of evil.

With Hegel and Darwin, *God is eternally unfolding*, a perpetual revolution. This leads to paganism, as ancient as Heraclitus, B.C. 500.

With Spencer God is *the Unknowable* which leads to eternal spiritual darkness, which destroys all religious emotions and joy.

With Christ God is *the Heavenly Father*, omniscient, all-love and all-good, the Jehovah of old.

Speculative philosophy concerning God is a fruitful source of skepticism. It starts out with a proud pretension of explaining all things, and winds up with doubting everything, with agnosticism.

The Christian Idea of God

Is it not a fact that Christ's idea of God, the Father, as presented by himself and his apostles, comes nearer the truth than philosophy had ever gone, or shall ever go? In revealing the Father, in word or parable, he did not attempt to define the Infinite One. He taught that "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in Spirit and in Truth."

In speaking of God as Father, as impersonated in the waiting, anxious father of the returning prodigal, Christ did not aim to define God, but to symbolize Him in terms of a noble human father. Men who speak disparagingly of such figures of speech, calling it "anthropomorphic" only talk foolishness.

Who does not know that God does not stand with outstretched arms to embrace a repentant sinner? Yet the fact is infinitely more true in spiritual reality, for the returning sinner. When God is spoken of as "Walking and talking with men," who does not know that such language is only a symbol and not a description?

While we may never be able to describe it, we know that there are depths in the mercy and love of God which we may know only as the swallow knows the lake by skimming over it and dipping the tips of his wings into the waters. And we are uplifted and thrilled that we may dip the tips of our spiritual pinions in the depth of His infinite love and truth!

In the teachings of Christ and Paul we have not the weird mysteries of the philosophers, but the simple out-spoken message of

Him who came to reveal the Heavenly Father to listening hungry souls, bringing to us the true nature of God. Here we learn that God is an infinite Personality, touched with a feeling of our infirmities, giving us the Holy Spirit more willingly than an earthly father gives blessings to his own children. "In my Father's house," said Christ, "are many mansions. I go to prepare a place for you, that where I am there ye may be also."

This is Christ's picture of God, the Father of all, as revealed in Christ Himself. In the conception of such a God, "the father of us all," the brotherhood of man becomes a possibility in all nations and at all times. This conception of God as the Father of all men, has given mankind a noble conception of one another. Men become friendly to those whom they regard as brothers.

The cannibals of South America were cured of cannibalism when they were brought to think that in eating human flesh they were eating their brothers. All the world becomes more humane under the thought of a universal brotherhood, and war has been outlawed because of such a conviction.

While God is infinite and everywhere, He manifests Himself in particular to every earnest seeker. He that holds the world in the hollow of His hand, cares for every individual. "The very hairs of our head are all numbered," and "not a sparrow falls to earth without His knowledge." These are Christ's words, and they present us his idea of God.

The conception of an ever-present God is the life of the world, "in whom we live and move and have our being," and the natural sequence of events as the manifestation of divine goodness, is purely a Christian conception of God. That Jehovah is free from national limitations and set forth as the Sustainer of the universe, the spiritual parent of mankind, was first established by Christ and Saint Paul.

The theory of Divine action implied throughout the Gospels and Epistles was the first complete monotheism ever attained by mankind. Here we first have God disassociated from limiting circumstances, with which He is entangled in all ethnic religions (*The Idea of God*, p.77, Fiske).

An Absentee Divinity

It is no doubt difficult to trace the origin of that philosophy which pictures God as an absentee divinity, ruling a mechanistic universe grinding out results by a fixed law after a predetermined plan, and coming in touch with it by some occasional portent and prod-

gy. It is enough to know that the doctrine is here and is a gross disturber of religious thought, and is the basis of much "modern science." Entrenched in a popular "hypothesis" it plants itself directly across the path of Christianity and is determination from start to finish.

John Fiske was inclined to think that the early Christian philosophers, Clemens, Origen and Athanasius, "got their idea of God from the Stoics, who held that deity was immanent in the universe and operated through natural laws." That these eminent philosophers were students of Stoic philosophy, is true; but in no case were they entrapped by the Stoic fatalism. These same men were profound students of Christianity, and vigorously defended it from the false philosophies of the times.

Origen was of the opinion that the East got its philosophy from the Hebrews. All three of these fathers were stanch defenders of religious freedom as against the doctrine of determinism. They were pioneer champions of Christianity as taught by Christ and presented by the Apostles, and they gave us a theology which has never been displaced. Whatever the philosophy of their day may have taught, they knew the Scriptures, and they knew by personal experience the truth of Christ's teachings and the riches of his religion.

Echoes of the philosophy of their day may be seen displayed today, such as "all men are divine, some more than others," and God is in everything. Much of Spinoza's philosophy concerning God is Stoic. So, also is the Humanistic trend of today. If allowed full swing, this Stoicism will, as its tendency indicates, ultimately destroy the spiritual nature of Christianity.

Individual philosophers may have had their noble conceptions of God, but it remained for Christ Jesus to lift the God-Father idea up into a Christian theism. This he made plain in his life and teaching in such a manner as to find its way into the heart of common people and philosopher alike. Its acceptance was hastened and its hold upon mankind was immensely strengthened by the spotless ethical teachings of Jesus. This conception of God is so fundamentally true it must remain the theism of both religion and philosophy as long as the human family shall endure. As it has adjusted itself to the local conditions of the various nations in the past, so also will it continue to adjust itself in the future, "till the earth shall be filled with the

knowledge of God as the water covers the sea."

Some may want to ridicule such an idea of God, and speak of it as "Anthropomorphism," or a "mental projection of the times," but the fact remains that such a conception could not have originated with man. Water cannot rise above its own level. The lesser cannot produce the greater. Pagan conceptions of God have always been gross and groveling. Here the intercourse of personality with personality appears. One cannot conceive of the divine personality revealing Himself to any one but to a personality, not to insentient gold or diamonds.

It is an exceeding satisfying thought to think that the Creator who has bestowed upon mankind the exalted powers of personality, such as intelligence, freedom and the sovereignty of self-determination, must Himself be possessed of such attributes,—since it is in this respect that God made us in His own image. That there is a human element in the character of God was implied in Christ's remark that "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Such conceptions of God never originated with finite man; they came from a higher source, and that source is God himself, through Christ His Son. Did not Christ say: "All things that I have heard of my Father have I made known to you?" Here is the great truth.

The beautiful life that Christ makes possible constitutes his kingdom coming down from God out of heaven. What wonders that writers will engross themselves in its mystery and beauty. Its fascinations never cease. "Blessed is the nation whose God is Jehovah!" The glory of any great nation is its God!

Richmond, Kentucky

The Love of Christ

All that Jesus did for His Church was but the expansion and unfolding of His love. Travelling to Bethlehem, I see Love incarnate. Tracking His steps as He went about doing good, I see Love laboring. Visiting the house of Bethany, I see Love sympathizing. Standing by the grave of Lazarus, I see Love weeping. At Gethsemane, I see Love sorrowing. Passing on to Calvary, I see Love suffering, bleeding, and dying. The whole scene of His life was but an unfolding of the deep, wonderful, and precious mystery of "Redeeming Love."—*McCheyne*.

Miracles and the Laws of Nature

W. BELL DAWSON, M.A., D.Sc., M.Inst.C.E.

Chapter I

THERE is among all peoples a desire which seems to be inherent in the human mind, to *explain* what we see around us. What are the heavenly bodies, what causes the rain and the lightning, how did plants and animals originate? Such questions as these and a thousand more, are the problems amongst the older peoples who were closer to nature than we now are; and the most puzzling inquiries about the nature of things, are among the first questionings of children. This desire to explain, is the basis of much of the mythology of the ancients, which deals largely with how and why things are as we find them.

In modern times, science endeavours to offer more reasonable explanations for the causes of things. Yet if we were to take an extreme view, and refuse to make use of every modern appliance that we cannot completely explain, we would be cut off from many conveniences. Very few people know much about the electrical principles involved in the telephone or the radio; and even for scientists, the truth is that we are using many appliances that we do not fully understand.

It would be equally unreasonable, therefore, to make the sweeping statement that we will not believe in any miracle which we cannot fully explain by the ordinary laws of nature, especially when the miracles in the Bible are always set before us as having a rational purpose in view. It is this aspect of the miraculous that we propose to deal with here.

One of the most prominent features in the progress of science in recent years, is the discarding of theories and explanations that were formerly accepted. We need therefore to be cautious in accepting explanations, because they may be based on theories which are more or less unfounded. A theory in science is quite allowable; indeed, it would be difficult to make any investigation without some theory to work upon. Yet any theory must be regarded as provisional.

Let us take light for an example. It appears that the most acute question in physics at the present time is the problem of the nature of light. Is light corpuscular or undulatory in structure? Which theory are we to accept? One theory applies more specially

to light while it is travelling along as an undulation; and the other accords with its behaviour when it strikes an object which it illuminates. Sir William Bragg, who is a leader in the investigation of crystalline structure by means of the action of light, puts the question of a working theory thus: On Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, we adopt the one hypothesis; on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, the other. We know that we cannot be seeing clearly and fully in either case; but we are perfectly content to work and wait for the complete understanding.

Science by its progress therefore, is not finding explanations for all that was known; but on the contrary, its researches and inventions, during the last half century especially, have brought out a vast array of new discoveries which require to be explained. It is true therefore to say that scientific men are largely dropping the endeavour to explain things; because the further we go, the more we find that there is to explain.

Science is thus becoming rather cautious about explanation; and the trend is to find out all we can and to leave the explaining alone, till we know more. For when we discover the deeper nature of many things which formerly appeared simple, we are brought to realize that our view of them had been quite too superficial; and that possibly there may be more yet in the background behind what we now know. Yet surely these discoveries should give us a greater reverence for the Creator, who devised all these wonders which we can only explore.

We may see in all this the wisdom of the Scriptures in not entering into explanations of natural occurrences. We may also admire the self-control of the writers of the Bible, in avoiding so entirely the explanations which were current in the mythology of their day. Yet it is more than remarkable that the descriptions of nature which they give, are so invariably correct; especially when we find, down to our own time, that writers and poets, as well as artists, make so many mistakes by depicting what they could never really have seen; or saying in a flight of fancy, what in fact is untrue.

Miracles likewise are described just as they were seen to occur; and they are stated

to be an act of God, in the same way that all happenings in nature are attributed to Him as the great First Cause. It is He who makes the sun to rise; He stills the stormy waves, and the lightnings are His. The Scriptures do not therefore *explain* miracles, any more than they explain the rainbow or the whirlwind. Would it not be wise on our part to adopt this same attitude, and to be less anxious to find explanations for miracles? For, if we try to offer an explanation for them, the scientists warn us that our clever theory may soon prove to be superficial and inadequate.

How Miracles are Regarded

There are three attitudes that we find towards miracles: There is (1) the Believer, who is quite content to say: If God is the Creator, He can do anything, and there is no difficulty about His working miracles. As Sir Ambrose Fleming remarks:

Can we refuse to admit that God can control the energies He has brought into existence? Even King Nebuchadnezzar was led to acknowledge that "He doeth according to His will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay His hand, or say unto Him, What doest Thou?"

(2) There is next the Scientist, who says: When we are surrounded by so many marvels that we cannot understand, why should we say that miracles are impossible? Indeed, if we define a miracle as something that we can neither comprehend nor explain, all the realms of science are becoming more and more miraculous to us, as we advance further.

(3) Then, thirdly, there is the scholar who takes the Modernist view. What he advocates is this: Get rid of the miraculous in the Bible, and the Gospel will be widely accepted; for the miracles are the obstacles that stand in the way of this.

We have then this strange situation; that it is not the men of Science who object to the miraculous in the Bible, but religious leaders who are Modernists. These go so far as to say that any who believe in miracles are Obstructionists that are unwilling to accept the results of scientific and literary research. This is evidently an unfair accusation, for it is unbelief that blinds the eyes; and the Bible does not discourage learning and investigation.

Moses was "learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." Solomon not only "spake three thousand proverbs," but "he spake of trees, from the cedar tree . . . unto the hys-

sop"; and "he spake also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes." Daniel and a few others were selected for further instruction, because they were "skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science."

The reproach was brought against the Apostle Paul: "Much learning doth make thee mad." The Bible does not extol ignorance; and credulity is the child of superstition, which the Scriptures everywhere denounce. (See the booklet entitled *The Bible, Science and Superstition*, by the writer.)

The Laws of Nature

The most common objection to miracles is that the Laws of Nature are fixed and unalterable; and if a miracle occurs, these laws are broken, set aside, or upset. If we give careful thought to this view, we will find that it is so one-sided or partial, as to be really misleading; because there is another principle everywhere in nature, which is this: The higher levels dominate and over-rule the lower levels beneath them. This is eminently true when we reach the realm of life, whether plant or animal life, above the level of the merely mineral.

To make this clear, we may recall the three broad divisions in nature: (1) The Mineral or non-living, which in chemistry is termed inorganic; (2) Plant life, or the vegetable kingdom; and (3) Animal life. Above these three, there are mental and spiritual forces and powers, which in a limited degree are possessed by man, seeing that he was made in the image of God; but spiritual powers extend beyond and above the human level. We find then in these various realms, that the higher can over-rule the laws in the realm below.

Let us take a commonplace example on the human level. A child falls to the ground and bruises itself; the mother says: "Child, you have disregarded the law of gravity and have fallen; and by falling on a hard surface you have bruised yourself, which is another law of nature. You cannot expect me to interfere with the laws of nature, which are fixed. So there you are." Is this a right interpretation of nature? Is the mother a slave to the lower mechanical and physical laws? By her muscular power, which is above these, she lifts the child up; yet in doing so, she does not set aside or suspend the action of gravity, but merely undoes what gravity has done. By her intelligence, on a higher level still,

she can even do something to alleviate the pain of the bruises, which were caused by the law of mechanical impact.

It will make our subject much more simple, standing of miracles, if we follow out this great principle of over-ruling laws, in the relation of each realm of nature to the one below. This is most evident in the chemical aspects and relations of these realms; and we may need to explain some chemical action for the benefit of those who may not have much knowledge of the subject. We must take chemistry in its widest sense; for the whole visible universe is composed of the chemical elements; the stars above, the rocks and the forests, as well as our own bodies, are all made up of the elements with which chemistry deals.

Uplift by Vital Forces

It will make our subject much more simple, if we follow it through the successive ages of geological time in the past, during which the laws of nature came into operation successively; for in the world as it now is, the means by which plant and animal life are sustained constitute cycles of interacting agencies that are very complex. We may begin at the time when the land first arose from a universal ocean, which is a stage in the progress of the earth that is indicated in Genesis and which is also generally recognized amongst Geologists.

What then did this land consist of? There would soon accumulate along its shores, sand and mud, gravel and shingle, and such like; with quite possibly, in places, melted material which came up through volcanoes. The world was then made up entirely of mineral substances, or what are technically termed inorganic materials; and among these, water and air must be included. There was no soil or earth; for garden earth consists largely of decayed vegetable matter, and we are speaking of a time before any vegetation existed. The whole world was under the dominance of the laws of physics and inorganic chemistry, and nothing could take place naturally which did not conform to those laws. There was light and heat, rain and lightning; rivers could run, and waves beat on the shore.

One of the outstanding laws in this inorganic world was the propensity of oxygen, which by itself is a gas, to combine with the other chemical elements. The substances that result from these combinations are mostly liquids and solids. This action took place

during the infancy of the world on an immense scale; for somewhere about half the weight of the rocks of the world, as well as the sands and clays, is made up of oxygen in a state of combination with other elements. Also, more than three-quarters of the weight of all the oceans and rivers of the world consist of oxygen; for water is a combination of oxygen with hydrogen in which the oxygen has by far the greater weight.

The wonder is that there should be enough free oxygen left over, which is not combined with something else, to make the air fit for animals to breathe. We can only attribute this remarkable fact to the foresight of the All-wise Creator, in justly proportioning at the beginning, the relative amounts of the elementary materials of which the earth consists, for requirements then in the future.*

Plant Life

When this life came upon the scene, an entirely new set of laws began to operate. The simplest requirements of a plant, are water and carbonic acid, a gas everywhere present in the air, which is a combination of oxygen with carbon; and water is another compound of oxygen, with hydrogen. What the plant must do to live, is to take up water by its roots and absorb this carbonic acid gas; and it decomposes these and rebuilds their constituent elements into other compounds with which it nourishes itself.

Now, on the lower inorganic level with which the plant has to deal, the law is that oxygen combines with carbon; yet the plant or tree is able to overcome the natural affinity that these have for each other, and separate the combination into its original elements; and it is through this remarkable achievement that the plant obtains the simplest kinds of nourishment for its maintenance.

There is reason to believe that the amount of carbonic acid gas in the air was much greater in proportion in the earlier ages of Geology than it is now. The way in which plant life has been able to tear apart this compound of carbon and oxygen, and derive carbon from it, is well exemplified in the Coal Formation. For the vigorous vegetation of that age decomposed a vast quantity of carbonic acid, and the carbon from it is now found in the form of coal beds, in various places in the world.

Even the humblest forms of vegetation

* The Scriptures give some hint of this. See Isaiah 41:12.

present a marked contrast to what existed previously. In the first place, all vegetation consists of cells which if they are to live at all, must contain chemical compounds that were unknown before in the inorganic world.*

Not only so, but any plant, if it is to increase or grow, must have nourishment; and it has to manufacture this nourishment from inorganic material by reversing the chemical laws which in the former ages were the only ones in force. It is thus that it manufactures starch and sugar from the three chemical elements (hydrogen, oxygen and carbon) which it obtains from water and carbonic acid. Starch and sugar are representatives of a large class of the simplest of nourishing substances,** but higher grade nourishment still is required, especially if the plant is to reproduce itself by means of seeds.† The plant requires a further chemical element (nitrogen) to produce this high-class nourishment which is found chiefly in its seeds, such as peas and beans, wheat and oats.

It is thus evident that vegetation belongs to a higher realm altogether than the inorganic; and it is not possible that it could have originated from any inorganic substances, because the primary chemical laws governing these, are reversed in their operation by plant life.‡ By so doing, plants not only sustain themselves and provide the high-class nutriment required for their reproduction, but they are a prophecy and a preparation for the land animals that were afterwards to appear upon the face of the earth. For the whole support of these animals, the cattle, the birds and even the insects, is derived directly or indirectly from the food products which the vegetable kingdom supplies; since the carnivorous creatures feed upon others which subsist on vegetation. Those that display the most vital activity, such as the birds, live chiefly on seed and grain, which supply the highest grade of nourishment that plants have to offer. Science thus recognizes that plant life must have been first, before animal life; which is the order set forth in the first chapter of Genesis.

When we ask how the plant performs this

miracle of re-arranging the chemical elements into higher-class substances, we find ourselves brought face to face with one of the greatest marvels in nature. The plant can only accomplish this transformation on which its own nourishment and growth depends, by means of a substance named *chlorophyll*. This word is merely the Greek for "leaf-green"; which serves as a name, because in reality we know little about it.* This chlorophyll, under the action of light, enables the chemical changes to take place that we have referred to; and it appears that without it they would be impossible, and no plant could grow. For, in the humblest type of plant, which is only microscopic and consists of a single cell when mature this one cell contains chlorophyll (or granules called chromatophores, not always green). It is necessary to seaweed as much as to land plants; though in some of these its color is different. It may be thought that there is an exception to this rule when a root may be made to sprout in the dark and become a blanched plant, but this apparent growth is not real; for it merely uses up the substance in the root, and when this is exhausted, it dies. No plant growth, due to added substance from without, can take place without chlorophyll. It would appear therefore that all vegetation depends upon it, as a means by which the necessary chemical transformations take place for their nourishment.†

In the progress of the world, we see then that the beginning of plant life introduces a new force, which is able to stoop down from the higher platform on which it stands, and raise the lower inorganic substances to its own level. When thus transformed, the plant can incorporate these products into itself, for its own upbuilding. In making this transformation, it requires the help of light and heat, and these older forces are thus shown to have new uses, previously unrevealed.

The plants give us a further conception of the foresight of the Creator; by showing that the chemical elements, which for ages had remained in an inorganic condition in inanimate compounds, were so designed originally as to be capable of forming the high-class

* Notably, the substance called protoplasm, in the comprehensive sense which is now given to that term.

** The carbohydrates; which include also cellulose, the basis of all wood fibre.

† The Proteids; which are nitrogenous compounds, such as the gluten of wheat, the legumin of peas, and vegetable albumin found in seeds. The power of the seed to live and grow depends upon these proteids.

‡ Any idea of "spontaneous generation" is now quite discredited, according to the latest scientific works and encyclopædias.

* "It is certain that chlorophyll plays some part in the process of assimilation, and that its presence is essential; but how it acts in assisting the process is unknown; its physical and chemical properties, so far as they are known to us, affording no certain clue to the solution of the problem." Watt's *Chemical Dictionary*. Its mode of action is still "very imperfectly understood." *Encyc. Amer.* of 1922.

† We here leave out of consideration the parasitic plants which obtain their nourishment ready-made from higher types, or feed on their decay. For these do not require chlorophyll and are often colourless.

combinations required for food products, fibre and tissues. Nor is this honor bestowed upon the more complex; it is a few of the humbler chemical elements, near the lower end of the series, that are thus used for the highest purposes; and this is further seen in later ages, when animals came into the world; for it is these same few elements, and these the more simple ones, that form the greater part of their bodies.*

How did these new energies and powers of plant life originate? We may give them the name of "vital force," but this does not explain the matter. Nor can Evolution offer any explanation; for these powers and properties are in no sense an outgrowth of what preceded them; they dominate all that they found in the world when they appeared, and put it under tribute. Light and heat, sunshine and rain, the material elements themselves, are all taken hold of by plant life and put to new uses, to serve the purpose of this new order of things.

In relation to the inorganic world which went before, the realm of vegetation is quite miraculous. We may well accept the explanation that the Bible gives us; that this new stage in nature was brought into being by the command of God. For, "God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind. . . upon the earth; and it was so." (Gen. 1:11.)

Animal Life

When animal vitality came into being in the world, we discern a new force of another type which can lay hold of plant material and raise this to higher levels still, speaking from the point of view of chemistry, which best brings out these distinctions. For the animal feeds upon vegetable material and transforms it into higher compounds, much in the same way that the plant in its sphere, deals with the inorganic elements. The simplest example will make this clear; for the sheep with only grass to eat and water to drink, can turn these into blood and muscular flesh, as well as brain and nerve material. Such substances are quite out of reach from the level of plant life.

To understand the further uplift from the plant level which animal vitality is able to accomplish, we need to distinguish definitely

between these two types of life. The best distinction between plant and animal is shown by the two different ways in which they obtain their nourishment; for this distinction holds as far down as the simplest forms.

A typical green plant is able to live independently of other organisms and to build up its substance from simple gases in the air and inorganic salts in the soil or water. A typical animal, on the other hand, is not able to exist apart from other living organisms, since it is not able to build up its substance from simple chemical constituents (as a plant does), but must be supplied with ready-made proteids in its food, for which it requires other organisms, either plants or animals.*

This may be put more concisely still:

A gap separates vegetable and animal life. These are necessarily the converse of each other; the one de-oxidizes and accumulates, the other oxidizes and expends.†

For the animal maintains its bodily heat by oxidizing the plant products which it eats, just as heat is produced from wood and coal when they combine with oxygen.

This essential distinction holds even amongst the innumerable animals and plants that consist of a single cell; for it is only when a cell contains chlorophyll that it is able to live directly upon inorganic material. A very simple example of the way that an animal nourishes itself, is afforded by the *amoeba*, a one-celled animal which merely wraps itself around its food, so that for the time being it seems to become all stomach; and actual digestion takes place. The food it thus eats, is a one-celled plant (a diatom or a desmid). Animals with more specialized organs, have a mouth and a stomach to deal with their food; but the method of nutrition is the same throughout the animal kingdom. It scarcely needs to be explained that when animals live by eating others, those that they feed upon have already formed their substance from vegetable materials.

It is so important to make the distinction clear between vegetable and animal life, if we wish to understand the sequence which we are following, that we may be pardoned for digressing to give some further explanations. It is the more necessary to do so because of the evolutionary view that confuses the issue, which is now found all the way from text-books to encyclopædias. According to evolution, life began with some simple one-celled organism, which as time went on,

* By far the greater part of the weight or bulk of plants, and of animals (apart from the bones), is formed from only four elements: hydrogen, carbon, nitrogen, and oxygen; which are among the first eight in the chemical series of 92 elements.

* *Encyc. Brit.*, eleventh edition; article: Protozoa.

† Sir William Dawson, in *The Story of the Earth and Man*; eleventh edition, page 326.

gradually developed into plant forms on the one hand and animal forms on the other. Writers holding to this as a fixed and primary idea, are under strong temptation to confuse the distinction between plant and animal in the interest of their theory; while they quite overlook that chemically, in regard to their nutrition, these are the converse of each other, as we have pointed out.

In the world of microscopic plants and animals, consisting primarily of single cells, there are said to be as large a number of classes and species as among all the plants and animals of higher types. Amongst them all, the disease germs are probably the best known to the public generally; types which correspond to the scorpions and vipers amongst the higher creatures; while the great categories of useful or harmless ones are scarcely heard of.

In dealing with these one-celled organisms, there are some species that may require careful investigation to determine their plant or animal nature. Many text-books enlarge upon the doubtful character of certain types that live in decaying organic material, and give the unsuspecting student the impression that these were the "primary ancestors" of both vegetable and animal life. But if they obtain their nourishment from the material or organisms which are of higher type than themselves, they could not live until these higher types came into the world; and how could these be their descendants?

Indeed, the time has come to challenge the prevalent idea that what is simple was necessarily earlier in the world than the more complex. Since the discovery of disease germs, this idea is plainly contradicted in that region of investigation; because these germs could only exist after the higher animals on which they prey, came into being.

It is also directly contrary to the most foundational discoveries in recent physical science. For amongst the chemical elements themselves, there is no exemplification of evolutionary upbuilding of the higher from the lower; but we know definitely that the most complex atoms at the top of the series (Uranium, Radium, and some others) gradually disintegrate into lower types. These complex atoms must therefore be placed earlier in time than some of the simpler atoms at a lower level. This runs directly counter to evolutionary theory, and it relates to the very basis of material things, in regard to the primary atoms of matter.

Would any then presume to limit the action of the Creator, by insisting that the simplest things must first come into existence because their theories require this? If the light that is given to us in Genesis by the Creator Himself were more generally accepted, we would be saved from much futile speculation and our investigations would be guided into sane paths, leading to trustworthy results. For we are there informed, in regard to the question we are discussing, that vegetable life is not only distinct from animal life, but that it preceded it in time.

We can explain this to a child; there must first be grass and then the sheep; and God thus made provision in advance for His creatures before He created them. This successive order holds all the way down to the one-celled creatures, where we can see under the microscope the amoeba devouring a diatom, a vegetable cell which the amoeba finds to be in the world before it. For diatoms are everywhere present in both fresh and salt water; and they afford the most important source of food for some of the smaller animal forms, which in turn support fish life.

It is necessary thus to point out the outstanding difference in the nature of animal and vegetable life; so that we may realize that when animal life came into the world, it laid claim to lordship over the whole vegetable kingdom, whether in the sea or on the land. It put vegetation under tribute to it, and demanded from the plant the products which it had elaborated (the carbohydrates and proteids) and devoured these as its food. The animal, however, humble it might be, was able to raise these food products to higher levels still in the chemical scale; and to produce from them flesh and blood, nerve and brain, as well as the secretions required for digestion.*

* In these, there are a few additional elements (besides lime in the bones) which are in relatively small quantities; notably sulphur and iron, as well as phosphorus, chlorine, sodium and potassium, which are the basis of the acids and alkalis in the body.

NOTE—This article is now available in pamphlet form. Price, Twopence. Address, The Bible League, 45 Doughty Street, London, W. C. 1.

Dr. Dawson is Gold Medalist in Geology and Natural Science; Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada; Member, Engineering Institute of Canada; Laureate, Academy of Science, Paris.

Because of insufficient space for completion of chapter one we must ask our readers to wait until January issue for completion of this chapter and also for chapter 2.

George Frederick Watts

RUTH SLOAN, B.S.

ENGLAND'S greatest poet painter and one of the greatest of any age or country was George Frederick Watts. A contemporary of Newman, Ruskin, Browning, he, with them, reflects the moral earnestness and conscious purpose of the Victorian Age. It was an age when poets, prose writers, and painters worked under the shadow and burden of a conscious social responsibility. Almost all of them were makers of doctrine, preachers of some crusade, or propagandists, offering some cure for man's perplexities and despairs. Instead of the mere light-hearted interest in life which the Elizabethans show, instead of the dreaming of the Romantics, the Victorians faced life with a mood of prevailing earnestness and seriousness.

So it was with Watts. He was a thinker and a painter. The most salient characteristic of his painting is intellectualism, a contempt for the doctrine of "Art for Art's sake." Said he, "I paint ideas, not things." And it is true. Ideas inspired his career. They were the reason for his art. He painted to serve his generation. He sought to impress upon his age the ideals men had forgotten. He desired to narrate and to teach, to touch the hearts and souls of the crowd, to recall men to their high destinies. Robert de la Sizeranne has put it: "It was as though an angel had come down from Heaven and said to him in English, 'Work! no matter if your pictures are bad, you must save souls.'"

And so he set about his mission—Art that would teach; Art that would urge men on to higher things and higher thoughts.

My aim is now and always will be to the end, not so much to paint pictures which are delightful to the eye, but which will strike the intelligence and the imagination, to kindle what is good and noble in them, and which will appeal to the heart.

Never did he make his appeal through homely realism; he did no still life, no landscapes, "for they prove nothing," he said. Mythology, antiquity and mediaevalism furnished him symbols through which he could convey his truth. Well has he been called "the painter of eternal truth." No picture he has painted but might be a sermon. "Time," "Judgment," "Death," "Conscience," "Mammon," "Hope," "Love and Death," "Eve Created, Tempted, Repentant," "Love and Life,"—all, abstract ideas, which, having passed through his powerful and sympathetic

mind, are portrayed upon canvasses of marvelous power.

Criticism surrounded him. Mythological or symbolic painting was held to be false and decadent. Personified figures, as his of Death, Justice, Time and Love could be nothing more than "spiritless decorations for the ceilings of public buildings or confectioner's shops." Art must free itself of didacticism and stand alone for its own sake. All this he ignored. And laboriously he wrought until the symbols he brought forth, Love, Death, Life, stand out as no mere decoration, but human, and the very core of life.

During his lifetime Watts' "Love and Death" and "Love and Life" hung opposite each other in the Kensington Museum. People flocked to see the two great paintings, and the figures they saw though of beings who had never existed, incorporated within them a condition of life that fired men's curiosity and interest. Nothing in life is more powerful, more inevitable than love and death. And so Watts is the painter of these two truths, "not of hateful or ridiculous death, nor of tricky or sensuous love." His "Death" is benevolent and his "Love" manly. Inspired by genius he paints them, Love and Death, and in them, great as he has conceived them, beautiful as he had made them, he reaches the climax of his work and thought.

His work leaves a profound impression on the imagination and an awe in the soul. Men have called him "gloomy;" and it is true that he has painted nothing to amuse us, nothing to please us, no graceful forms, no delicate shades, no dreams of joy. These things he dismissed as meaningless, and always with deep earnest purpose he conceived and portrayed the central truths of life. He was indifferent to glory, to fame, to criticism. He did not even think that he had painted well; he thought that he had done something better—his duty. He was an idealist who sought to teach the crowd morality. He wanted to put scenes from the Bible in the railroad stations. His house in Kensington he filled with great symbolic paintings and threw it open on Sundays to all comers. At his death he bequeathed his works to the human race as a whole, each nation to have a share.

His great canvases will be significant in

any age, for they portray those truths of life that men find deep within themselves. He is an incomparable artist, an idealist, a thinker, a painter; his great symbolic compositions are the product of a man who saw truth clearly and who portrayed it powerfully.

Haddonfield, New Jersey

Christmas Meditations

THE rationalism of our times stands silent and embarrassed at the gateway of Bethlehem. There is no intellectual side door by which the escape can be made from the great events which crowd the memory at this holy season of Christmas. All is in the region of the supernatural, and yet all is in the region of the human reason. The whole story is so unadorned and yet the whole story is so highly artistic and elevated that nothing exists to parallel or explain it. The Gospels are free from imitation, and yet are equally free from contradictions. The solemn and glad reality of these major events in world-history maintain their pre-eminence with the moving of the centuries. There is nothing in modern science nor in the sincere search of philosophy which either confirms or denies. It was the dawn of a new order of life, and it stands apart from all other recorded births and advents; and thus knows of no evidence that sustains or repudiates. A great sense of gratitude bestirs itself in the heart of one who can and does believe in the miraculous, for if miracles do not happen, the first Christmas morning never was. If the miracles are not realities, then the great condescension, of which Paul speaks, never did occur. If God was not in Christ, then we are among the most deceived of men and must hide our faces in shame because of the great delusion. If the miracle of miracles did not take place in the hour of the great Annunciation, then the Sun of righteousness does not shine, and we are straggling across the jungle, with no light adequate to bring us through the darkness. However, in spite of all these wild and foolish suspicions and doubts, the whole story is true, though the half has never been told.

In our Sabbath-school lessons we have been standing with Isaiah on the mountain peak, where visions of this coming One are constantly being intimated, and then we are suddenly startled by the bold, clear outlines of One who is both the Man of Sorrows and

also the everlasting Father and Prince of Peace. No one else has ever appeared who so uniquely united these two natures in one Person, as our theologians would say. The fulfillment of the great prophetic argument is a piece of history and of literary record, that is crowded with arguments not easily dismissed. There is a renewed interest today in the study of Jesus among Jews, as he is set forth in the New Testament and very specially in the Four Gospels. That is a very dangerous adventure in historical research. Paul tried it with great success in his public and personal effort at winning men for Christ. We will watch with deep and prayerful concern for the outcome of this work of honest research. It is not salvation, but these same Scriptures are able to make one wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus.

Paul tells us that fact, and Christian history has proved it to be true. This, after all, is the conclusive argument from which honest minds cannot make their escape. The wise Men may have often faltered in the long march which seemed to lengthen as the days passed, farther from home and more distant from the new-born King. It was not till the star rested above the royal city of David and the holy Child was found, that the fear of failure departed. It was then that their joy was full, their faith assured. Hitherto they tremulously believed, but now they knew.

"What Christ means to me," is not what Buddha means to a devout Buddhist. Jesus of Nazareth is more than our ideal, or exemplar, or inspiration. Ten thousand witnesses recall that great and memorable day when with deep penitence they cast themselves upon his mercy and found him able to save unto the uttermost. One of the most impressive features of Paul's ministry as reported by Luke in the Acts, is the Apostle's greatest argument when placed before magistrates and kings. It was his universal resort to weapons that made rulers tremble—the story of how Jesus met him on the Damascus road and saved him with a great salvation. Then "Christ in me" became the motto of his ministry and his life, till that great life came to its tragic but glorious finish. Or did it ever finish? He who came as a Babe to Bethlehem came to Paul of Tarsus on the highway, and has come to our unworthy hearts and into a thousand lives known and read of all men. Crowning evidence!—*Selected.*

For Your Scrap Book

REVEREND A. WALLACE COPPER, B.A.

William Penn

WILLIAM PENN has been regarded by many as an unpretentious character who lived out a monotonous existence. There could be no opinion farther from the truth for it falls to the lot of few men to live through such a historic decade as did the unostentatious Quaker. He lived through the great plague, the great fire and the almost unbearable persecution under the clarendon code. He was born in Tower Hall which was the scene of the tragic deaths of patriots and traitors; his childhood was passed in Ireland at the crucial period of Cromwell's settlement; and he was sent to Oxford in the year of the restoration. Penn carried dispatches from one of the great battleships which in a few hours was to shatter the power of Holland and handed them to Charles the second; he was borne from the Quaker Meeting House to prison and became the center of one of the historic trials of English history. The only portrait we have of this apostle of peace is in a shining armour.

The father of William Penn was an accomplished seaman who at twenty-two became the captain of a ship to help put down the Irish rebellion. His mother was a Hollander and that is why the saying has been written that the founder of Pennsylvania was "half a Dutchman." One of the traits of the Penn family was their tenacity for friendship. They could keep their friends from youth to maturity. Penn's father elevated himself to the position of Admiral in the king's navy and was assigned his duties along the Irish coast. At the age of thirty-three Admiral Penn was second in command of the British Navy and was present in almost all of the nine battles that brought about the defeat of Holland and won back for England the prestige bequeathed by Drake and Raleigh.

The Wesleyan Revival touched only the fringe of the educated classes while Puritanism permeated society from top to bottom. Presbyterianism had learned to trust their universities; but now came George Fox, the unlearned shoemaker, who with his homely

provincialisms swayed the people as the prodigies of Oxford and Cambridge could not. Under his influence the force of Quakerism grew until it became a power with which England must reckon. He refused to bear arms and the leaven of pacifism found its way into English life. Soldiers left the field and returned to their work; many a fighting sailor in Blake's squadron in the act of training his gun upon a Spaniard would turn away and refuse to take a life though he would meet certain death at the hands of a military court. Persecution did not thin the Quaker ranks for every ploughman was a missionary, every convert an apostle.

When Admiral Penn and his family moved to Ireland this new sect had already made progress. Thomas Loe, a preacher from England and trained at Oxford, pronounced his truths in the streets of Dublin. William Penn heard him in Macroom Castle and declares his eloquence stopped the mouths of mockers and won the people to him. Penn the younger never could quite shake off the influence of that night. Said he, "Thomas Loe seemed to be speaking to me."

In 1660 William Penn, at seventeen years of age entered Oxford University. There never was a time in its history when the institution was as interested in the political life of the nation. The high church ritual was introduced at chapel. He resisted this and revealed his Quaker trend by refusing to attend the service. Like John Wesley, a hundred years later, he held prayer meetings in his room. For this he was fined having been found guilty of nonconformity. It was not long until he was expelled from the university. We do not know the exact cause of the dismissal, but the most likely cause was his refusal to attend chapel. Admiral Penn felt the disgrace of this and turned him out of his doors but soon welcomed him back.

William Penn went to France to be educated by traveling and he saw the hypocritical courtesies of court life. He became a student at a Huguenot school and sat under

the teaching of the most learned theologians of his day. It was here that he found himself surrounded by young men who shared his ideals. When he returned to England he found that the nation was in the grip of license. Cromwell was dead; the king was restored; the country was free.

In 1666 London was visited by the great plague. On the doors of the woe begotten city were countless red crosses. In the month of September eight and ten thousand people died each week. Throughout this terrible year Penn studied law which was to prove more practical than any part of his education. When as a Quaker he stood as a criminal in the dock he was able through his knowledge of English law to claim its protection. When he framed the constitution of Pennsylvania he brought to the task not only a reformer's idealism but the political wisdom of a trained lawyer. As he went each day from the navy office to the law courts he walked through streets grown green with grass and past churches whose tolling bells were never silent.

William Penn said the plague revived his sense of the "vanity of this world." Fifty years before, William Shakespeare had walked those same streets and through the mouth of Hamlet poured out his sense of "the vanity of this world." Like Hamlet, Penn had returned from abroad to show himself for a few weeks "the glass of fashion and the mould of form." Like him he was obsessed by the thought of the imminence of death and its sure summons to all men, politicians, lawyers, fools and beggars who were alike borne daily on the common cart to an undistinguishable grave.

In Ireland the Quakers succeeded in business and soon people dealt with them because of their honesty. William Penn heard that Thomas Loe was in town. The next day found him in the Quaker Meeting house. After the service he went to a friend's home and talked long with Loe. It was then he resolved to be a Quaker and in a few weeks was arrested for taking part in a service.

The last three years had been terrific for England had experienced the plague, the fire and the Dutch in the Medway. The empire had been bereaved, buffeted and disgraced. The Quakers worshipped under protest. When the door of their meeting house had been boarded up they worshipped in the street and were dragged to jail and then transported to Jamaica. The glory of these dark times is illuminated by those Quaker

women who Daniel DeFoe reminds us went from house to house helping the poor and sick and to the prisons to care for those suffering for truth's sake.

Admiral Penn was ordered to take charge of the summer fleet, but his enemies decided he would not. They trumped up charges of embezzlement against him and by a vote of the House of Commons he was impeached. The elder Penn knew that he, as others, was a scapegoat to deflect attention from the king's misappropriation of public funds. There was perhaps no more poignant moment in the life of that frivolous monarch than when his old servant, Sir William Penn, meeting him in Westminster Hall the day before the impeachment, shouted to him that he was his martyr. Young William in writing a vindication of his father's life declares that no public man ever left this world with a clearer conscience.

Most pitiable of all, Lady Penn, his mother, turned against her so called impractical son. She did not see why in a time of such a crisis her beloved son should add to the burdens of his father's soul. One arrest followed after another until the patience of his father was exhausted and in the heat of fervor the son was turned out of his father's house. At such a crisis he met the girl who was to become his wife and in whose home he would find peace of mind; whose parents stimulated him in his Quaker views so that before the end of the year he was in the tower. During the first seven years as a Quaker he wrote no less than thirty books, and because one book was published without permission he spent nine months in the tower.

Admiral Penn, in the closing years of his life, had learned to respect his son's convictions. Once he had decided to disinherit the young Quaker but now he changed his mind. When persecution broke out in London William Penn was arrested for speaking in the Gracechurch meeting house. When he was brought to trial his experience as a law student enabled him to defend himself to the jury. The jury acquitted him, but the judge demanded a verdict of guilty and in spite of the fact that he kept the jury two days without food, and finally fined them, they persisted in their acquittal of William Penn. When the judge observed that he could do nothing else and noticed that Penn kept on his hat, he held the Quaker for contempt of court. It was only under protest of the son that the weakened admiral paid the fine so he could see William Penn before death over-

took him. How he wondered if his son, once deprived of his father's prestige, would find a nameless grave in some prison bed or be sent to Jamaica which he had won for the crown. Believing himself near death he wrote to the Duke of York and the King and begged them after his passing to be kind to his son. They assured him he need not worry and this was a promise that was kept. The last request of the old admiral to his son was that he should be true to his conscience.

On March 5, 1681, William Penn wrote to a friend declaring that in honor of his father the king had given him Pennsylvania. The time was ripe for a new world for England was steeped in corruption and the crown decided to rule without the Parliament. William wanted the land just called "Sylvania," but he wrote, "They added Penn to it."

Pennsylvania was to be an example to the

outworn nations of Europe, a holy experiment, governed by love instead of force. It was to be a refuge for persecuted Quakers. Within three months in America Penn had so mastered the language as to be able to converse with the Indians without an interpreter. In one stroke he abolished slavery and it is a fact that for seventy years Pennsylvania was a Christian state.

The life of William Penn is only understood as we see the forces of the century in their proper light. Out of the darkness of the plague, the black smoke of the fire, the disgrace of the Dutch in the Medway, the persecution of the Quakers, we see the fearless figure of William Penn remaining aloof from the vices of the century and setting before those storm driven people the example of a Christian.

Philadelphia

Young People's Department

REVEREND HAROLD JOHN OCKENGA, B.A.

Topic for December 11

Herod—Wickedness in Life

Scripture—Exodus 20:5; Isaiah 53:2

TRUTH is stranger than fiction. No novel reads as interestingly as the history of murder, rapine, intrigue, romance, love, and politics that are inextricably connected with the story of the family of Herods—from 47 B.C. to 100 A.D. Across the pages of its record stalk Julius Caesar and his slayers Cassius and Brutus, Pompey, Mark Anthony, Cleopatra, Octavius Caesar, Nero, and Trajan. In sacred history interwoven with the story of the Herods is the history of Jesus, of John the Baptist, of the Apostles, of Paul, of the Church of the first century, and of the fall and destruction of the Holy City Jerusalem. The background of every New Testament book is somewhat connected with the history of the Herod family.

Wickedness runs in families. That of the fathers is visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation. It has been said by one that either the wickedness runs out in four generations or it runs the family out. The Herod family, in its historical significance, consists of just four generations. Some think this law of heredity is a terrible thing, but the student of history will conclude that it is a wonderful thing. The end of the Herod family was a great blessing to the people of the first century.

The Family History of Wickedness

For 34 years Herod the Great was the absolute tyrant of this kingdom—practically equal to that

of Solomon. Immediately his great wickedness began to be manifest first in connection with his insane jealousy of anyone who seemed to have a claim to the throne. On the slightest pretense he put men to death. The brother of his beautiful wife, Mariamne, he first elevated to the priesthood, and then caused him to be drowned while they were bathing in Jericho. Following this he had the aged Hyrcanus slain. Mariamne and her mother, Alexandra, thinking that they too were to be objects of his jealousy, were in constant apprehension and attempted to escape to Cleopatra. Herod caught them in the act, and this along with other accusations caused him to put to death the chaste Mariamne, whom he really loved with a violent passion, and as soon as he became aware of what he had done, he was almost driven insane with remorse. His love was greater in her death than it was in her life. He commanded his servants to call out her name as if she were living, and attempted to divert himself by the institution of games, the erection of great buildings, and the pursuance of wars.

But soon he married again. He took to wife his two nieces, also Malthace, a Samaritan, and Cleopatra of Jerusalem, and five others, including a second Mariamne. By all but his nieces he had children, and these began as soon as they reached a proper age to plot one against the other, and to incite the jealousy of their father against each other. Alexander and Aristobolus, the sons of Mariamne were put to death, and finally Antipater, his oldest son and the claimant to the throne, was slain five days before Herod's death.

One year before his death the wise men came

to Jerusalem. No wonder that Herod was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. For surely here was the birth of a successor to him. All people knew that he must soon die. When the wise men returned to their country another way, Herod sent his henchmen to Bethlehem with the command that they should slay every child under two years of age in the village.

Finally from a dread disease, after having exhausted the possibilities of human passion, a benevolent friend, a cruel and merciless enemy, a suspicious tyrant, an insane lover, and an ambitious man, he came to his death. Knowing that no one would mourn him, he commanded that all the prominent Jews should be gathered together at Jericho for a conference. They came with one accord, and then were seized on and locked in the hippodrome, where he had them kept until his death with the command that when he died these Jews should be put to death so as to cause a real mourning among the people.

Herod, the Tetrarch

The next Herod spoken of in the Scripture is Herod the Tetrarch. He was the son of Herod the Great, who along with his brother Archelaus and Herod-Philip received their portions of the kingdom. It was this Herod who was the weak immoral consort of Herodias. He had married a daughter of Aretas, the king of the Parthians. Upon a journey to Rome he lodged with his brother, Herod-Philip, and while there indulged a guilty passion for Herodias, Philip's wife. Herodias was his niece by blood relationship. Nevertheless, he divorced his wife and she divorced her husband, and the two returned to Galilee to live.

All this was contrary to the Jewish law which was broken by it on three counts. When John the Baptist began to preach, this weak Herod enjoyed hearing him, but soon found himself denounced as a sinner by this mighty prophet of God. Herodias did not let her anger rest at this prophet until she had his head, the story of which all of us know (Matt. 14:3-12).

Shortly this man returned to Rome at the instigation of Herodias to ask for the title of king. But his nephew, who in the interim had been reared in Rome and was now invested with the title of king of Judea, wrote letters of accusation to his student friend who was now emperor. When the Tetrarch came to the emperor Caius, instead of receiving a crown, he was banished to Lyons in Gaul, where he died in 39 A.D.

Herod Agrippa I

The third Herod spoken of in the Scripture is this nephew, Herod Agrippa I. He was the grandson of Herod the Great, and the son of the murdered Aristobulus. His early days were spent in Rome, where he was bred in close fellowship with Caius. One day, by an injudicious remark implying that he wished Caius were on the throne instead of Tiberius Caesar, he was seized by the latter and thrown into prison and manacled with a chain. However, in six months Caius became emperor, and he rewarded Agrippa by giving him a golden chain like the one with which he had been manacled and bestowing upon him the title of king of Judea. At the banishment of Herod the Tetrarch, he received the realms that were formerly his uncle's.

It was this Herod that was a Jew by profes-

sion and who instigated the first persecution of the church. He slew James, the brother of John, the Apostle, and he imprisoned Peter with the purpose of slaying him, but was prevented by an angel. At Caesarea he accepted divine honor and worship from the people, and immediately was stricken with a dread disease so that his body was consumed of worms.

Herod Agrippa II

The fourth Agrippa was the son of this man known as Agrippa II. He received only a part of his father's domains, that is, the northern section. And along with his sister, Bernice, he ruled them weakly. During his reign, Paul was summoned before Festus, who examined him in the presence of Agrippa and Bernice, and Drusilla who was Festus's wife. It was this man who trembled and said to Paul, "almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." The fourth generation had come, and the iniquity had been visited upon them all. And now the representative of this family trembles upon the brink of refusing his opportunity of salvation. Within ten years, armed insurrection began in Jerusalem in spite of his efforts, and the Roman emperor, Titus, after a long siege leveled Jerusalem to the ground in 70 A.D. and slaughtered the inhabitants regardless of sex or age. Herod Agrippa II and Bernice his sister departed for Rome where they lived till 100 A.D. when the last of the Herods died.

Strange story, closely interwoven with the birth, life and death of Jesus, with the ministry of John the Baptist, with the persecution of the church, with the condemnation and death of Paul, and with the destruction of Jerusalem. Many are the minor characters of this family, but we cannot speak of them here.

The Marks of Wickedness

Three great marks of wickedness exist in every member of this family.

1. *Intrigue.* From the beginning, deceitfulness, dishonesty, and evil motives were connected with the ambitions of this family. Brother connived against brother, uncle against niece, father against son, wife against husband, and daughter against mother.

2. *Impurity.* The great prototype of it all was Herod the Great, who was insanely jealous of Mariamne. And yet this character of Mariamne stands out in history like that of Vashti who refused to perform the degrading commands of Ahasuerus. Her nobility of character and her glorious carriage was shown even more in her death than in her life. She walked to her execution calmly contemptible of all the sin that was raging on all sides of her.

Herod the Tetrarch, likewise broke all of the laws of the Jewish state by his marrying his own niece who was the divorced wife of his brother. The accusation of John the Baptist against him that he was living in open adultery caused John the Baptist's death.

Herod Agrippa II reached the height of impurity. He, without marriage, lived with Bernice his own sister as a wife. The scandal was so great that Bernice had to implore another to marry her; but later Bernice returned again to live with Herod Agrippa II. Also Salome who performed the dance of the Seven Veils in the

presence of Herod's drunken princes married her own uncle, Herod Phillip.

As one looks about at this mark of wickedness existing in American life today he is almost as astounded as when studying the history of this family. The things which are going on in the name of marriage and divorce, openly and uncondemned in this nation are a disgrace. The loose talk in papers, magazines and books and lectures upon premarital relationships, and the evident sanction of it bid fair to bring upon us the avenging wrath of God in a visitation upon the children of this generation.

3. *Impiety.* The Herods violated every sacred institution of the country. Herod the Great invaded and slew the Sanhedrin, the highest religious organization in the country. He made and unmade the high priests, and murdered them at will, violating the very law that he professed. He lost all regard for the dignity of life and of man, murdering his wives, his sons, his subjects, his priests, and his political opponents, climaxing his career with the slaughter of the innocents in an attempt to wipe out the life of the Child Jesus Christ. This family forgot the rights of men, substituted self for God and accepted worship, which was the height of blasphemy. Impiety, impurity, and intrigue marked the wickedness of every member of this family.

The End of Wickedness

A glance at the end of these men brings to us a great object lesson upon the value of virtue. Herod the Great was stricken immediately after the execution of Mariamne with a burning disease, and died from it shortly after the slaughter of the innocents. Josephus in the antiquities described it as follows as far as it is possible to repeat.

A fire glowed in him slowly which did not so much appear to the touch outwardly as it augmented his pains inwardly . . . his intestines were ulcerated and violence of pain lay in his stomach. His members rotted and putrified and produced worms that began to consume his body, matter ran from his sores. When he sat upright he had difficulty of breathing which was very loathsome on account of the stench of his breath and the quickness of his return. He tried every remedy of the physicians to no avail, and was soon deceased.

The Tetrarch died in banishment away from all friends and all of the comforts of life. Herod Agrippa I was eaten up of worms, according to the secular writer Josephus and the scriptural narrator, because he accepted worship like God. Herod Agrippa II seemingly died in Rome in peace. He was the fourth generation and wickedness had played itself out. The promise of God was fulfilled.

The influence of this family was terrible. Universally they were hated by the people; they were a bane upon their friends and enemies. Untold suffering and sorrow were caused by their actions. Jews, Parthians, Syrians, Egyptians, Romans, and Greeks were all affected by their sin and their ruthless violations of the laws of nature. Only eternity itself will reveal the influence of these four generations of wicked and ungodly men.

Out of this dirt, this famine of righteousness, this crumbling of morality and this degenerated background came John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, and Paul the Apostle, all born within a few months or at the most a few years from the death of Herod the Great. They were tender plants springing out of the dry ground.

Topic for December 18

The Magi—Following a Star

Scripture—Matthew 2:1-12

THE number of wise men who came is not known, and different numbers have been hit upon, but it seems from the gifts that they offered that they were three. This was accepted by the western church as a sacred number, symbolizing the Trinity and other Christian doctrines, and the venerable Bede gave to them names which have no real authority but are as good as any three others that could be invented. They were: Kaspar, Melchior, and Balthasar.

In the eastern church, there was less desire for this symbolic meaning and the tradition assumed a different character. According to it, the Magi arrived at Jerusalem with a retinue of a thousand men, leaving behind them on the further bank of the Euphrates, an army of seven thousand.

Lew Wallace in his novel, *Ben Hur*, pictures these three Magi as coming from three great sections of the world, then meeting at a certain place under Divine guidance, and then pursuing their journey to Bethlehem. That might have happened, but it may also be that one first caught the vision and aroused his two friends to the joy of the quest. But whether they were from Egypt, Greece, Mesopotamia, Chaldea, Assyria, Persia, or Arabia, we behold in them the coming of the first Gentile worshippers of Christ, the Magi.

The same prophecy which made the Jews anticipate a Messiah was generally known throughout the east. Yet the Scripture gives a more immediate cause for the march of the Magi. It was because they received a vision of a star that led them on the journey. They were students of the stars, probably astronomers; they may have been astrologers—men who attempt to read the destinies of men and of nations in the stars. The relation of these men to the star gives to us three possibilities.

They Might Have Followed the Material Star

The question is, what kind of a star was this? Was it a star that literally went before men as they walked upon the earth, and does it mean that it pointed out to them the house in which Mary and Child were found? Personally, I cannot see that it makes much difference whether the miraculous was connected with it or not. When we make room for the supernatural at one point, it may also occur at another. But for the one to whom this is a stumbling block, it is well to remember that a natural phenomenon may explain it.

They Might Have Followed the Spiritual Meaning Back of This Star

There are some people who possess things for the sake of the things themselves, but others who recognize spiritual meaning. Browning said:

All that I know
Of a certain star
Is, it can throw
(Like the angled star)
Now a dart of red,
Now a dart of blue;
Till my friends have said
They would fain see, too,

My star that dartles the red and the blue!
 Then it stops like a bird; like a flower hangs furled
 They must solace themselves with the Saturn above it.
 What matter to me if their star is a world?
 Mine has opened its soul to me; therefore I love it.

This star was for Browning that beautiful character, Elizabeth Barrett Browning, his wife.

This star may have represented to them what they had been searching for and longing for for a long time. It may have represented a great happening. They didn't know what. It reminds one of that old story of Tennyson of the "Search for the Holy Grail." Is it too much to say that these wise men were Galahads, and to them, because of their high motive and pure character, was given the privilege of seeing what was behind that star?

This is perfectly consistent with the teachings of Zoroaster who had prophesied the coming of three deliverers, the greatest of which should be Zosiosh, under whom there should be established a kingdom. Is it not natural to expect that devout souls of Persia, as Simeon and Anna were allowed to see the Infant, should also have the satisfaction of their desires? So they came to the Jews and were told where they might expect to find the Messiah in Bethlehem. Some have considered this whole thing a myth because Matthew is the only one who records it. Nevertheless, it is one of the most natural and supported events of the Scripture.

They Might Have Known and Did Know the True Star

The highest purpose possible in the lives of these men and that only which would have been rewarded with a vision of the Messiah is that these men sought the King of the Jews. They had combined their study of astronomy, the teachings of their own prophets, and the scriptures of the Jews, and now for two years they had sought this king who was to be born, and who deserved their allegiance and their worship. Why they did not arrive for two years after the Child was born, we do not know. Perhaps great obstacles had lain in their path. But now at last they come to Jerusalem to the city of the Jews to that wicked man Herod, in order that they might innocently inquire for the object of their search.

The city was startled, and Herod was alarmed as the news that a king had been born to the Jews was spread abroad. The Sanhedrin was convoked to determine the place of His birth. All knew that the end of the reign of this king was near, and that soon there must be a successor. What is more, Herod knew it, and trembled. The Jewish experts decided from the prophecy of Micah (Micah 5:2, 3), that Bethlehem was to be the place of the birth of the King. Secretly, Herod attempted to gain a way to find the new born Child, and he inquired the time when they first saw the star that he might be sure of the time of the birth. And then he sent them on their way expecting that they would return to him. As they left Jerusalem toward the south, again in the heavens they saw their star, brilliantly shining, and joy filled their hearts. And they came to Bethlehem, and went into the house where abode Mary and Joseph and Jesus. The Child was now nigh unto two years of age.

Here was the Child whom they sought. Here was the meaning of their star. Here was the true

Star of Jacob, yea, the bright and Morning Star. What they saw was not what we are accustomed to think they saw, shepherds, a manger, an infant in swaddling clothes, but instead, there was the lisping, waddling child, just learning to walk, living in a humble home in Bethlehem. How their story confirmed all that had been told to the Virgin Mary. How her heart had treasured up the announcements of the angels, the miraculous events of almost two years previous, the adoration of the shepherds. Then had ensued months and months of silence, but now everything is confirmed by the worship and the story of the Magi. They tell her of their thoughts, their experiences, and their expectations, and then close their stay with the holy family by presenting the customary gifts of subject nations.

Then in a dream they were warned to leave, to retreat another way than that by which they had come.

It was a flight, yet it was a triumph,
 For they carried home richer treasures than they brought.
 They found more, far more than they sought,
 They had sought a king, and they found a Saviour.

They reached the consummation of their lives, and could depart in peace. They followed the star, and they found the Star of Jacob, the bright and Morning Star. They gave their wisdom to the search of real truth, and they found that truth in the Child. They were filled with joy because they followed a star.

O Star of wonder, star of night,
 Star with royal beauty bright,
 Westward leading, still proceeding,
 Guide us to Thy perfect light.

Topic for December 25

Simeon—Well Done, Depart in Peace

Scripture—Luke 2:25-35

SIX weeks after the birth of Jesus in the manger His parents took Him on His first pilgrimage to Jerusalem. While there an interesting meeting took place, that of the Christ-child with the aged Simeon. There is nothing more striking than the contrast between an infant and an aged person. I recall seeing an old friend of mine who now is ninety-one years of age taking his tiny granddaughter and standing on the beach in California while the two of them passed out Gospel tracts to the multitudes that passed by. That saintly old man and the little girl made a remarkable picture. Something like that must be the picture of Simeon and the Christ-child at the eastern end of the temple while the multitudes passed by in their fulfillment of the rituals.

Paul tells us that Jesus was born under the law, and fulfilled the demands of the law. He did that in many of the great acts of his life. Eight days after His birth in fulfillment of the angel's command, He was named Jesus, and was circumcised. This circumcision was the sign of His covenant relationship of the people of Israel. It was not necessary from the nature of this Child that these rites should be performed unto Him, for He was born without sin, and was different from all other men. Yet in each of these acts He identified Himself with sinful man. The remainder of the ritual, however, could not be performed in Bethlehem. It was necessary for Joseph and Mary to travel the six miles over the hills

and valleys to the temple at Jerusalem. This journey was not undertaken, however, until forty-one days after the birth of the Child. He was brought with the mother to the temple that the purification rite might be performed.

A beautiful truth is brought to us here that we otherwise would have missed, namely, that the parents of our Lord were very poor. This rite should have been accompanied by the presentation of a lamb, but for the poor a turtle dove or two pigeons were acceptable. Consequently, we know the condition of the family of our Lord. This was preceding the coming of the wise men with their gifts of gold. While in the temple, it was necessary for them to present Jesus unto God, for He was the first-born of this family, and the custom was that the first-born should be redeemed. This custom was established at the exodus from Egypt when the first-born of Pharaoh and of all the Egyptians were slain, but those of the Israelites were saved. As a symbol of this the first-born was holy unto the Lord and had to be redeemed. In the fulfillment of these laws Mary and Joseph were in the temple.

In Jerusalem, a man who walked with God, was ordered by the Holy Spirit to go into the temple and in obedience followed the injunction. The personal history of this man is interesting. There are two theories about him. One is that he was the son of ancient Hillel who was the president of the Sanhedrin which the youthful Herod the Great slaughtered. Hillel was the only member of that group whose life was spared. No doubt, if this were true, Simeon at this time would be even older than Herod, who was about seventy-five. For Hillel was the most famous of the Jewish rabbins when Herod was twenty-five. The son of this Simeon was Gamaliel, the famous teacher at whose feet Paul was educated in Jerusalem. This theory seems to be reinforced by the silence of the Mishnah, one of the Jewish Talmudic books about Simeon, and also the advice of Gamaliel to the Sanhedrin of his day to refrain from hindering the apostles from preaching the Gospel. From these two facts it seems that there was a tendency in the family toward sympathy with Christianity.

On the other hand there is a theory that this Simeon was simply a layman, a common ordinary individual of Jerusalem upon whom God sent His Spirit when the clergy fell into a state of apostasy. It is true that there were many Simeons in Jerusalem at that time, and it is true also that Luke does not mention him as an outstanding individual, but calls him, "a man at Jerusalem." One may, quite legitimately visualize either of these in his mental picture of Simeon. Certainly whether a clergyman or a godly layman, his appearance was that of an old man, a wearied Jew who had been waiting long years that he might behold the consolation of Israel.

Glorious group of four who comprised this meeting so full of meaning for the church. Taking the Child from the hesitant and yet happy mother, he held Him close, and gave thanksgiving to God that he was privileged to hold and to behold God's Christ.

Simeon—His Personal Experience of God

From all those then living why was it that Simeon was picked to behold Christ? Certainly

there must be a reason, and that reason is included in the Scriptural description of this man. It says that he was just.

Now justice does not mean simply moral righteousness. It has a much deeper relationship to religion than that. It was a matter of being considered or declared just in the sight of God. This man was like every other man. But the difference between him and any other man was that he was blameless before the law, for he fulfilled with faith every requirement of the law which included sacrifices for the broken law. When he sinned he presented the correct sacrifice of God. He performed these in faith, not the New Testament faith which transcends the teaching of the Old, but in a faith which in its deepest import presents not a religion of merit but a religion of grace. For at the heart of the Old Testament religion of Israel are these words, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight shall no man be justified." He had faith in the coming Redeemer. Paul says that the righteousness which is of the law is that the man which doth those things shall live by them.

Simeon was just and righteous. He even surpassed this, and was devout. By devout the Scripture means that he was pious. He had a religious frame of mind. He was worshipful and reverent of God and of the things of God. A mighty contrast is this to most people in our age. Not that God desires an unnatural piety which results in a holier-than-thou attitude, but He does require this frame of mind from those to whom He will give His grace.

Furthermore, it says that the Holy Ghost was upon him. Acknowledging that the Holy Ghost came upon men at will in the Old Testament dispensation so that even some unbelievers, such as Saul and Caiaphas performed works under the influence of the Holy Spirit, nevertheless, it is clear that this is parallel to the experience enjoyed by the Christian when he is filled with the Holy Ghost. Like Jeremiah and the prophets this man had the Holy Ghost upon him. About this experience Jesus said, "After that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, ye shall have power, and shall be my witnesses."

Even though Simeon was the type of religious person that we have found him to be, we still wonder how it is that he knew that this Babe was the Lord's Christ. In answer to that the obvious thing is that he was a personal student of the Word. He, along with Anna, was a leader in a group of faithful people who knew from the Scriptures that Christ was to come. Many are the Old Testament prophecies concerning the coming Messiah, and great was the expectation at certain times among the people of this coming King. The Pharisees scoffed at the coming of an individual at all. The Sadducees expected a worldly king, and in between there was a group of righteous individuals who looked for a suffering Messiah. Far back in the days of Jacob, the definite words were given. Read Genesis 49:10-12; Deut. 18:15.

Balaam and Moses (Num. 24:15-19; Deut. 18:15) prophesied about him, and the Psalms are filled with many references. Likewise, the prophets are prolific in their references to the coming Messiah. Isa. 7:14; 11:1; and the great servant passages telling of a suffering Messiah—read Isa. Chaps.

42, 48, 52, 53. Jeremiah said that his name shall be called, "The Lord our righteousness;" Daniel recorded the exact time when the Messiah should come and should be put to death, which he stated could be understood by the wise; Zechariah is definite in his prophecy about the thirty pieces of silver, about the king coming upon an ass, and about his end. Wonderful prophecies of the coming of our Lord clearly depicting the time and the manner and the effect of His birth. Nevertheless, with all this, it would be still impossible for Simeon to have recognized this Child as the Christ.

Another thought must be added to this: that Simeon came to the temple by the Spirit—that is, that he possessed a supernatural guidance. This is a much discussed problem today. Many are disturbed over the question of guidance. But what it is impossible for us to have today, it was not impossible for Simeon to possess. We have a type of guidance but it does not reach the height to which his attained. Both are due to the same condition, but both are not the same. His was a guidance like unto Peter's and Phillips' and Paul's. Ours is the privilege of all men. First, it was due to his heart purity. Peter said that the "Holy Ghost was given to those who obeyed God and who possessed purity of heart." Likewise, it was due to a close prayer life, one of diligent intercession and praise. And, finally, it was due to his obedience to the previous commands of God. No man today can expect guidance unless he has fulfilled these three conditions.

Simeon and Christ—His Prayer

Upon taking the Child in his arms, the Holy Spirit came upon him. He blessed God with a psalm that has not been recorded, and he blessed the parents. Then in a final prayer summing up the life that he had lived, he gave God thanks. "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace." The real meaning of this is, "now dismisses thou thy servant." Simeon had been literally employed by God in his expectation of the Christ. He represents himself as a sentinel whom his master has placed in an elevated position and charged to look for the appearance of a star and then announce it to the world. He sees his long desired star, proclaims its rising, and now accepts it as the sign of his relief from duty. The task of Simeon was done, and now the weariness of life was ended. He could depart in peace.

The peace that Simeon here possessed was that of unbroken fellowship with his Lord. For years he had served Him. Now he had seen Him and soon he would be with Him. It was the peace that comes to one at the happy satisfaction received in the completion of a task. He had untroubled security about the future. His life-long expectations were fulfilled by the God whom he trusted, why then should he not trust Him for the future?

There are two kinds of peace spoken of in the Bible; one is peace with God that comes when the individual has accepted Christ and his rebellion against God is over. Long had Simeon been at peace with God, but now he receives the peace of God which is the gift of the Father into the heart of His children at the satisfaction of their fulfilled appointments. This long waiting that was now ended is closely paralleled to the

waiting of those Christians today whose expectation shall be consummated in the Second Coming of Christ. Some shall be granted that sight, and Paul tells us that it should be our blessed hope in this dispensation while we are living spiritual lives and are fulfilling God's tasks for us.

In this Child Simeon saw the Lord's Christ; saw His salvation. In one sense he saw the personification of salvation in an individual, in another sense he saw only the apparatus prepared by God to accomplish the redemption of the world, and the redemption was still a future fact. Yet this redemption was to be a light to shine in the darkness that had descended upon the Gentiles. Simeon had the world view of religion. He perceived that God's Salvation came not alone for Judaism, but also for the world.

Simeon and the Parents—His Prophecy

At the close of his prayer this saint of the Lord addressed Mary in particular, probably in view of her particular relationship to Jesus Christ. Along with the sweet portion which he had given in his prophecy, he now infuses into his message a drop of bitterness which is terrible (Luke 2:34, 35).

This Child is set for the fall and the rising again of many in Israel. Perhaps the seeing eye of Simeon rolled back the years and saw the fall of the Jewish nation at its rejection of Christ due to the hardening of the hearts of the people. And then after centuries the rising again of that nation to a national conversion. But it is certain that his prophecy came to mean as the years have flown by that this child is either a stumbling block over which one falters, or is a mighty rock upon which one stands. He is a blessing or a curse to all who come in contact with him. In Him men are either saved or lost. One cannot go half way with Him.

This Child should be a sign spoken against. He would arouse in His life and throughout all history great opposition to Himself and to His teachings. Though ultimate triumph is assured to Christ in His cause, yet much opposition must be met in the interim. But if all men speak well of you in your preaching or your living of the Gospel, beware, for it is a sign spoken against.

And this Child would be the revealer of the hearts of men. By their relationship to Christ men reveal the caliber of their characters. Either they will hate Him and persecute Him in His cause, or they will accept Him and love Him, and after all Christianity is a matter of the heart. Faith, hope, love, patient, long-suffering all come from the heart. Sin, unbelief, personal impurity, and skepticism, likewise, come from the heart. One's attitude to Christ will determine the condition of his heart.

The Book of Acts

Editor's Note:

THE purpose of this study is to acquaint ourselves with the workings and the doctrine of the early church. There is no better book for this than Acts. It includes the background for eleven of the thirteen Pauline epistles and affords an opportunity to view their contents. There was no more challenging age in the history of the world than when the Romans ruled and Greek

culture was common property. This is the age of early Christian evangelization.

Our method will be to have the student follow the thought by working over the material himself. In so doing he will see whence came our conclusions. Those who are faithful from day to day in this study will benefit from it greatly in their future knowledge of the Bible. It is not our attempt to follow either the topics of the Christian Endeavor or the Epworth League.

Topic for January 1, 1933

INTRODUCTION

1. Read the book of Acts through rapidly thus getting a bird's eye view of the literary structure and the trend of the thought in the narrative.

2. Dr. Scofield has said that five key words of the Bible are: Preparation (the Old Testament), Manifestation (the Gospels), Propagation (the Acts), Explanation (the Epistles), and Consummation (the Apocalypse).

The book of Acts shows the propagation of the Faith by the Apostles. It may also be considered the operation of the Holy Spirit in the New Testament church.

Daily Devotions

Monday—Read Luke 1:1-4. Notice that Theophilus is addressed in both Luke and Acts. Do you think this is a real man or a literary form? Record your reasons. Theophilus means "lover of God" or "beloved by God."

Tuesday—What are the things which Luke considers "most surely believed" by the New Testament church? (Acts 1:1). This may be found by examining what Luke taught in his gospel.

Wednesday—Select one of the most surely believed doctrines whether it be the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, or the Atonement and state it in your own words, including scripture references to prove it.

Thursday—Memorize what you consider the key verses in the first two chapters of Luke which deal with the Virgin Birth.

Friday—What facts about Theophilus does the introduction to Luke's Gospel (1:1-4) give us—his instruction in the way, his conversion, etc.?

Saturday—What do you consider the purpose in the writing of a second book by Luke? The first one gave us the Gospel, what does the second one give us? Compare the ending of Luke's Gospel with the ending of Acts and determine if Luke intended a third book. Does Acts end abruptly?

Sunday—What in your opinion should a "Lover of God" believe, be, and do?

Delivery of a Talk

O Lover of God

Introduction—The Man Theophilus.

A. Lived somewhere in Roman empire before 80 A.D.

1. Because of abrupt ending of book—Early history—Makes some think there may have been a third book.

2. His life—Commercial—maybe official—man of means.

B. Called Theophilus, because of his love for God, and his being loved by God. (Common ex-

perience—Paul says, "Remembering thy love and faith"—Philemon.)

1. manifested by his protection of Christians, by his paying for publication of books.

2. manifested by his character—saint in Caesar's household. Time of great sin, but this man believed.

3. manifested by his interest in goings on of Christianity.

C. A Real Man.

1. Idea of a fiction held by some.

2. A Gentile Luke had met and whom he admired and through whom he sent his history to the world.

3. He wrote because he wanted all Lovers of God to.

a. Be acquainted with the things most surely believed.

b. Know the certainty of the things in which you were instructed.

c. Possess the dynamic which has propagated these things.

I—Theophilus, Be Acquainted with the Things most Surely Believed, by this sect called Christians. Outline of Luke's Gospel. Imagine you lived in the first century and were hearing about it for the first time.

A. The Virgin Birth—chapters 1-3.

B. History of the Perfect Life of Christ.

1. Baptism—3:21, 22.

2. Temptation 4:1-13.

3. Miraculous works:

1. Healings of demoniacs, Peter's mother, etc.

2. Fish, feeding multitude.

4. Wonderful teaching:

1. Parables. 2. disciples—sermon on mount.

Confession of Peter.

5. Transfiguration.

6. The garden and the trial.

7. His death and burial.

C. His atonement in that he forgave sins.

D. His resurrection and risen ministry.

II—Theophilus, Know the Certainty of the Things in which thou were instructed.

A. Theophilus had been converted, and catechized.

1. Perhaps he had been doubting.

2. Perhaps ideas prevalent in the time, or attacks had upset him—Gnosticism, Docetism, Ebionites.

B. Certainly came from scientific investigation.

1. Eye witnesses—consulted.

2. Historical narratives used by Luke—incorporated first hand investigation.

C. Certainty deals with facts and those facts do not change.

1. Interpretations may change, but facts do not.

2. The facts of the Gospel are always the same.

III—Theophilus, Possess the Dynamic which Propagated These.

A. The purpose of writing Acts may be explained as apologetic, before the Roman world to show it wasn't a prescribed religion.

B. Acts may have been written to show how to carry on—

1. Urge to wait for Him (Acts 1:4) Acts of the Holy Spirit.

2. How He came (Acts 2:1-14).

3. What He impelled them to do (Acts 3: to end of book).

Conclusion—Not only be catechized and assured of truth, but possess Christ and the Holy Spirit.

DISCUSSION

1. Can a man be a real "Lover of God" and not accept the Deity of Christ, the Virgin Birth, and the miracles?

2. Can a man be a "Lover of God" and not accept Christ as Saviour? Read John 8:30-46.

3. What relation does the New Birth (John 3) have to the "Lover of God?"

4. Did Luke intend that his urges and commands in Acts should go beyond Theophilus to the Christians of all ages? Are we fulfilling them?

The Library Table

CONDUCTED BY PROFESSOR LEANDER S. KEYSER, M.A., LL.D.

The Wonders of the Great Unveiling. By L. Sale-Harrison. The Evangelical Press, 3rd & Reily Sts., Harrisburg, Pa. \$1.25.

While this book was published in 1930, it has just come into our hands. During the last summer we learned to know and appreciate Mr. Harrison, having been associated with him on the lecture platform of several Bible conferences. He is a prince in the field of prophetic interpretation. This book deals with the Revelation of St. John. Mr. Harrison believes that this book was given by inspiration and was included by God's will in the New Testament canon to be studied and understood, and not to be slighted and ignored, as many people are disposed to do. He believes that the symbols can be interpreted, and that they stand for real occurrences in the history of the church. Many of them have been fulfilled; others are awaiting fulfillment. Perhaps some Biblical scholars will not agree with the author in some of the minutiae of his interpretation, but all people will find the perusal of this work on "the Great Unveiling" both interesting and profitable.

Hudson Taylor's Spiritual Secret. By Dr. and Mrs. Howard Taylor. China Inland Mission, 237 West School Lane, Philadelphia, Pa.; 150 St. George St., Toronto 5, Canada. Cloth, \$1.00; paper, 50c.

Here we have a brief and well-told life of that devoted man, the founder of the China Inland Mission. Today there are twelve hundred missionaries laboring in this great missionary enterprise, dependent solely upon God for their support. What was the secret of Hudson Taylor's life and work that made it so noble and effective? As the authors of this volume say, it is "an open secret." It was this: He drew "for every need, temporal or spiritual, upon 'the fathomless wealth of Christ.'" Dr. and Mrs. Howard Taylor have issued this volume for people who want to read a brief and inexpensive

biography of Hudson Taylor. Some years ago they published a life of him in two volumes; but many people prefer a briefer work, and here they have it in excellent form. It traces the natural and spiritual life of Taylor from his birth and childhood to the close of his useful and consecrated career, giving a graphic recital of the many difficulties he had to overcome and the many victories he won through his unbounded faith in both the grace and providence of God. His was not a tame life; it was a life of adventure, and many times of great physical peril. One cannot help wondering how he was able to endure all his trials and to escape from all the dangers through which he had to pass to carry the gospel to out-of-the-way peoples. But we need not wonder, after all, because we know the secret of his life—unbounded confidence in God.

Erich Ohlson. By Elizabeth Von Maltzahn. Translated from the German by B. Kruithof. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 234 Pearl St., Grand Rapids, Mich. \$1.50.

Get your map of Germany, and note the cluster of little islands dotting the sea to the west of Schleswig-Holstein. Those are the Frisian Islands, often beaten and flooded by the tempests that lash the North Sea, and yet, withal, lovely green pearls in the midst of the shimmering waters. The scenes of this strange and touching story are laid on those islands. What a locality for adventures of all kinds—physical adventures, spiritual adventures; yes, and for romance and love, too. The author is well-known in Germany for her artistic *motif* stories. While she writes with rare literary grace, and often with thrilling power, her religious purpose is very evident. The hero, Erich Ohlson, goes away to the university to study for the ministry, and becomes infected with liberalistic notions. His father and mother are pious people of the evangelical faith. He marries a

beautiful girl whose faith is also truly evangelical. After completing his theological studies in the university, he becomes the pastor of an evangelical congregation on one of the aforesaid islands. Imagine the result. With rare skill, and often with a pathos that brings tears to one's eyes, the author depicts the tense situations, the mental and spiritual struggles of the several parties concerned, and the sad effects of modernism; while the North Sea, often tempest-tossed, contributes its share in adding thrills to the narrative. Was the hero rescued from his unbelief? If so, how did it come about? Well, read the story, and you will know what was the grand climax. The translator has done his work well in good idiomatic English.

Men Who Knew God. By Professor M. O. Wee. Augsburg Publishing House, 425 South 4th St., Minneapolis, Minn. \$1.00.

The three Biblical characters herein depicted are Samuel, Amos and Haggai. The author is a professor in Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn., an institution of the Norwegian Lutheran Church of America. He affectionately dedicates his book to the students who have come under his instruction for twenty-five years. His book meets a need for all students of the Bible, especially those who ought to know more about its characters, its doctrines, its history and its practical teaching. Such knowledge is of value to people in their every-day lives. How much do we know about Samuel, the first great prophet after Moses? Are we informed about the place of Amos and Haggai in what is known as the prophetism of the Old Testament? How much could we recite on the spur of the moment on the life and times of the prophets enumerated? Well, along these lines this book is delightfully informative. The author tells us that the age of prophetism is usually set between the birth of Samuel and the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, although it really starts with Moses. It is divided into three stages: from Samuel to the division of the kingdom; from that time to the Babylonian exile; from the exile to Malachi. The author treats one prophet as a representative of each of these groups. Although his purpose is practical and educative, when he has occasion to do so he deals with critical problems, and always takes the evident and reasonable conservative view. The book will be valuable to all persons who want to increase their knowledge and appreciation of the Bible.

Additional Literary Notes

In our November number we gave a favorable notice of Jamison's *New Chronological Panorama of the Bible*. We should be glad if our readers would read our review over again, so that they might note its value as a Biblical chart. An error occurs in our review: The chart is printed on fine map cloth, instead of paper, as we said in our notice. This makes it of all the more value. The price of the chart is \$1.00. The author informs that an enlarged duplicate of this chart has now been issued, its dimensions being 4 ft. x 8 ft. Fixed on rollers it can be hung on the wall before an audience while a lecture is being given. Price of the large chart is \$40.00. We hope that these valuable charts will have a large circulation. Address Rev. Lewis H. Jamison, Long Beach, Calif.

It is gratifying to note that the British magazine, *The Fundamentalist*, edited by our friend, Dr. H. C. Morton, carries, on one of its cover pages, under the heading, "Books to Buy and Read," the advertisement of a number of American books: *The Virgin Birth*, by J. Gresham Machen; *Did Paul Know of the Virgin Birth?* by R. J. Cooke; *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament*, by R. D. Wilson; *Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History*, by G. Frederick Wright; and *The Doctrines of Modernism*, by Leander S. Keyser.

For some months we have had in our possession Dr. John Oman's book, *The Natural and the Supernatural*, published by The Macmillan Company, New York. It was not sent us for review, but we bought it. However, for various reasons we have not been able to command the time to read and master it, so as to give a judicious and adequate review of its position and contents. We now find that it is very modernistic. Dr. Oman, according to the title-page, is the principal of Westminster College, Cambridge, England. From another source we learn that he is the Professor of Systematic Theology in that institution, which is a college of the Presbyterian Church of England, and hence he holds a very important position. In order that our readers may be posted as to the serious character of the situation in the theological world today, we quote some sentences from the review of this book by Dr. Craig, in *Christianity Today*, of which he is the editor:

... The book affords depressing reading for those who believe that the Bible is the Word of God, and that the system of doctrine set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith is but a systematic expression of what God Himself has made known, after a supernatural manner, to the children of men. Principal Oman calls his book, "The Natural and the Supernatural." Its contents, however, do not justify the title. As a matter of fact, the book has practically nothing to say about the truly supernatural. Throughout, it confines itself to the sphere of the natural. It is true that much use is made of the word "supernatural" but nowhere is there any recognition of the supernatural in any proper sense of the word.

Further on Dr. Craig evidently puts a good deal of feeling into his criticism of Professor Oman's book:

Obviously there is no place for the thought of Jesus as the God-man in Principal Oman's thinking. At the most, Jesus is a prophet, in no real sense either Lord or Saviour. And yet he is not only the Principal, but the Professor of Systematic Theology in Westminster College, Cambridge, where the future ministers of the Presbyterian Church of England are being trained!

Another Presbyterian preacher and professor has broken forth in a piece of writing against the virgin birth of our Lord Jesus Christ. This time it is Rev. George S. Duncan, Ph.D., Professor of Oriental Literature and Archaeology in the American University, Washington, D. C. He wrote an "Open Letter" to the editor of *Christianity Today* for September, in which he maintains that our Lord's virgin birth is not an essential doctrine of the Christian system, nor necessary for the doctrine of the deity and incarnation of Jesus Christ. Therefore he holds that an applicant for ministerial orders in the Presbyterian Church should not be required to subscribe to this doctrine. Dr. Craig, the editor of *Christianity Today*, has replied very adequately to Dr. Duncan's contention in the same number in which the latter's criticisms appear.

The trouble is, the opponents of the virgin birth of Christ do not think the situation through clearly enough. How could there have been a real divine incarnation without the virgin birth? We have dealt with this problem in previous numbers of this journal, but let us repeat. If Christ was humanly engendered, he would have been a human person with a human ego or self-consciousness. Then He could not have been a divine person incarnate. Neither could a human person have been true deity. Nor could a merely human person have made expiation for the sins of the whole world.

If the contention should be made that the eternal Son of God united Himself with the human person, Jesus, that would have been only a *mystical* union of a divine person and a human person, and not a divine incarnation at all. Or if some one should claim that the union of the divine Son and the human person Jesus was hypostatic, then Jesus would have been two persons, a divine person and a human person. But Jesus was one person, not two. He never said a word to indicate that He had a dual consciousness. He always used the pronouns of the first person singular in referring to Himself. He said "I," not "We;" "Me," not "Us." What kind of a creature would a being with two Egos have been, anyway? All salient Scripture teaches either explicitly or implicitly that Jesus was one person functioning in two natures, divine and human, and all our evangelical theologies teach the same doctrine. When St. John wrote, "And the Word became flesh," the statement clearly connotes that the divine person who "was with God and who was God," assumed human *nature* not a human *person*. The historical doctrine of the *anhypostasia* of the assumed human nature of Christ must be maintained if we are to believe in the true deity and true incarnation of the Son of God.

Note how beautifully this is upheld according to the evangelical doctrine of the virgin birth. Then a human person with a human ego was not brought into existence; but the divine person of the Son of God was enshrouded and embodied in human nature from the seminal being of the lowly virgin. The divine person of the Son of God enshrined in human nature by the action of the Holy Spirit produced a real divine incarnation.

Another consideration proves the sanity and congruity of the orthodox doctrine. If a human person—Ego—was brought into existence by natural conception and birth, what became of it when the divine Son united Himself with that human person? Was it annulled or annihilated? What a sacrilegious thought! Or was it merged into the divine Ego? How absurd. Or were the human and divine Egos consubstantiated, thus making a *tertium quid*? That would have been no less preposterous. Yes, the merging of the divine and the human persons into one substance would have been pure pantheistic consubstantiation, which would have been farther from the Biblical doctrine than the farthest star is from the earth.